

*The* JOURNAL of  
SOUTHERN  
HISTORY

---

VOL. 6

FEBRUARY, 1940

No. 1

---



*Published quarterly by the*  
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

# *The Journal of Southern History*

VOLUME VI

FEBRUARY, 1940

NUMBER 1

*Published Quarterly by*  
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



## BOARD OF EDITORS

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL

University of Texas

AVERY O. CRAVEN

University of Chicago

WALTER B. POSEY

Birmingham-Southern College

ROBERT S. COTTERILL

Florida State College for Women

PHILIP DAVIDSON

Agnes Scott College

FRANK L. OWSLEY

Vanderbilt University

W. NEIL FRANKLIN

The National Archives

ROBERT H. WOODY

Duke University

## MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

## EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

## GUARANTOR

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY



Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

# *The Journal of Southern History*

VOLUME VI

FEBRUARY, 1940

NUMBER 1



Copyright, 1940, by the Southern Historical Association

## CONTENTS

<i>The Southerner and the Laws.</i> By Charles S. Sydnor .....	3
<i>The Economic Basis of Society in the Late Ante-Bellum South.</i> By Frank L. and Harriet C. Owsley .....	24
<i>Northern Congressional Democrats as Defenders of the South During Reconstruction.</i> By Albert V. House, Jr. ....	46
<i>The Fifth Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association.</i> By James W. Patton .....	72
<i>Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer.</i> By Fletcher M. Green .....	89
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
Letters To and From Jacob Thompson. Edited by P. L. Rainwater .....	95
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Strickland, <i>Religion and the State in Georgia in the Eighteenth Century</i> , by R. Casper Walker .....	112
McMurtrie, <i>Eighteenth Century North Carolina Imprints, 1749-1800</i> , by Lester J. Cappon .....	113
Hilldrup, <i>The Life and Times of Edmund Pendleton</i> , by W. Edwin Hemphill .....	114
Folmsbee, <i>Sectionalism and Internal Improvements in Tennessee, 1796-1845</i> , by R. S. Cotterill .....	115
Shugg, <i>Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana: A Social History of White Farmers and Laborers during Slavery and After, 1840-1875</i> , by Frank L. Owsley .....	116
Gohmann, <i>Political Nativism in Tennessee to 1860</i> , by Gerald M. Capers, Jr. ....	118
Davis, <i>The Cotton Kingdom in Alabama</i> , by Weymouth T. Jordan .....	119
Brannon, <i>Romance of Beginnings of Some Alabama Industries; An American Pilgrimage Address</i> , by V. L. Bedsole .....	120
Childs, <i>John McDonogh, His Life and Work</i> , by Mack Swearingen .....	121
Sitterson, <i>The Secession Movement in North Carolina</i> , by Henry T. Shanks .....	122
Hill, <i>Joseph E. Brown and the Confederacy</i> , by Richard E. Yates .....	123
Small, <i>The Road to Richmond: The Civil War Memoirs of Major Abner R. Small of the Sixteenth Maine Volunteers</i> , by Edwin B. Coddington ..	125
Dowd, <i>The Life of Braxton Craven: A Biographical Approach to Social Science</i> , by Alex Mathews Arnett .....	126
Nall, <i>The Tobacco Night Riders of Kentucky and Tennessee, 1905-1909</i> , by Thomas D. Clark .....	127
Frazier, <i>The Negro Family in the United States</i> , by Edgar T. Thompson ..	128
Cobb, <i>The First Negro Medical Society: A History of the Medico-Chirurgical Society of the District of Columbia, 1884-1939</i> , by L. D. Reddick .....	130
Smith and Beasley, <i>Carter Glass: A Biography</i> , by George C. Osborn .....	131
<i>Communications</i> .....	132
<i>Historical News and Notices</i> .....	135
Personal .....	135
The Southern Planter Centennial .....	136
Historical Societies .....	137
Bibliographical .....	138
<i>Contributors</i> .....	148

# The Southerner and the Laws

BY CHARLES S. SYDNOR

The student of southern history constantly faces the fact that the South is not a political entity with boundaries clearly marked by treaty, constitution, or law.<sup>1</sup> From this circumstance flow two consequences: historians disagree about the metes and bounds of the South, and, what is of more importance, they are compelled to seek unifying principles of southern history in social, economic, and cultural fields rather than in governmental history. Therefore, historians have concerned themselves chiefly with unique southern characteristics and, to some extent, with the causes of these characteristics. Some of them believe that the distinctiveness of southern society can be traced to an inherited cultural pattern such as that of the English gentry. Others emphasize environment: high temperature, heavy rainfall, coast line, river systems, forests, and soil types. Yet others find the common denominator of the South in such characteristics as slavery, malaria, hookworm, staple crops, lynching, tenancy, state rights advocacy, and mockingbirds. It is even true that some students believe that the unifying principle of the South is the prevalence of some intangible quality: its state of mind, way of life, attitude, loyalty, or viewpoint.<sup>2</sup> Into this twilight realm this essay ventures, for this is an attempt to set forth the Southerner's attitude toward

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read as the presidential address before the Southern Historical Association at Lexington, Kentucky, November 3, 1939.

<sup>2</sup> The search for unifying themes in southern history is either illustrated or discussed in the following works: Ulrich B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (Boston, 1929), 3; *id.*, "The Central Theme of Southern History," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXIV (1928), 30-43; Avery Craven, *The Repressible Conflict, 1830-1861* (University, La., 1939), 26-27; *id.*, *Edmund Ruffin, Southerner: A Study in Secession* (New York, 1932), 96; Richard H. Shryock, "Cultural Factors in the History of the South," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), V (1939), 333-46; Howard

law, using that word in a broad sense to include several of the imperatives that control man and society.

But before going into this subject, one word of explanation and another of warning are in order. The explanation is that the Southerner's attitude toward law is not being offered as the outstanding unifying principle of southern history; for it was but a secondary characteristic, a natural outgrowth and reflection of the social order of the region. The warning is that from the very nature of the subject this paper must deal with probabilities and trends rather than with absolute certainties. From some examples and a few indications the attempt will be made to arrive at the prevailing opinion of the dominant element in the Old South toward certain bodies of law. Opinion was not as unanimous as this paper may indicate because in brief space due consideration cannot be given to dissenting voices.

The Southerner was aware of the authority of Federal law, especially the Constitution of the United States; of divine law as it is stated in the Bible; of those laws, most of which are made by the states, that regulate the dealings of man with man; and of the unwritten laws of society. His attitude toward each of these will be appraised, after which some comments will be ventured about the relationships between these attitudes.

The fact that the Southerner chose to make comparatively few changes in the Constitution of the United States before adopting it as the Constitution of the Confederate States of America indicates his high regard for the older of these documents. Implicit in this decision and very clearly stated by many southern spokesmen is this distinction: the South liked the Constitution but it disliked the North's misuse and disregard of it. While it is true that the South was chiefly zealous for the defensive values of the Constitution, just as other sections have been when they have suffered from hostile legislation, the fact remains

W. Odum, *Southern Regions of the United States* (Chapel Hill, 1936); Garet Garrett, "The Problem South," in *Saturday Evening Post* (Philadelphia, 1821-), October 8, 1938, pp. 23, 85-86, 88-91; John W. Thomason, Jr., "The Old South Myth," in *American Mercury* (New York, 1924-), XLIV (1938), 344-54.

that for thirty years or so before 1861—years when the South was declining in its share of national population and wealth—it found that the Constitution was a very valuable asset. Naturally, its emphasis was upon state rights and those parts of the Constitution that recognized the existence of slavery. During these same years the North sometimes found that the Constitution stood in its way as it tried to gain political power proportional to its growing population. Therefore, some Northerners began to state that the Constitution was not the highest authority in American government; above it they placed other imperatives which were variously designated as the higher law, the laws of nature, the laws of God, the moral law, the spirit of the age, and the law of majority rule. Other and less radical Northerners did not go so far as to deny the supremacy of the Constitution, but they nevertheless insisted that it had changed with changing times and that its words could no longer be taken in their original and literal meaning.

Not unnaturally, the South affirmed that the Constitution continued to be the supreme law of the land and that its words had not changed their meaning. Through repeated insistence upon the Constitution's supremacy in its original, literal meaning the South came to regard itself as the special custodian and defender of this great legal document; its attitude toward the Constitution was one of great respect.<sup>5</sup>

In regard to the law of God, the South felt equally as well pleased with the orthodoxy of its own views. The barest outline of its reasoning was as follows: The Bible is the supreme revelation of God's law for man's guidance, and its validity is unchanged through the centuries; in the Bible are many passages recognizing the existence of slavery; therefore, slavery is sanctioned by the law of God. To such reasoning,

<sup>5</sup> Jesse T. Carpenter, *The South as a Conscious Minority, 1789-1861* (New York, 1930), especially pp. 158-60; Andrew C. McLaughlin, *A Constitutional History of the United States* (New York, 1935), 426-614; Dwight L. Dumond, *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States* (Ann Arbor, 1939), which contains an excellent analysis of the "higher law" views of the abolitionists. Gerald W. Johnson, *The Secession of the Southern States* (New York, 1933), uses biblical terms to contrast the southern and northern viewpoints. The South, looking to agreements made in the past, represented the Law; the North, looking to the future and seeking change, the Prophets.

antislavery theologians answered not with chapter and verse but with appeals to the broad teachings of Scripture: brotherly love, the Golden Rule, the equality of all men before God; and with nonbiblical ethical and social arguments. The South retorted that it was unorthodox to set up standards of conduct, no matter how plausible, contrary to the literal words of the Bible; it denied the propriety of the church committing itself to any program of social reform; and it added that northern reasoning about slavery was but part and parcel of northern religious anarchy evidenced by the rise of new cults, and the trend toward liberal theology, higher criticism, skepticism, and atheism.<sup>4</sup>

From the one Book defenders and opponents of slavery reached opposite conclusions, partly by antagonistic criteria of selection and partly by dissimilar principles of exegesis. The North usually appealed to the teachings of the New Testament, the South to verses of the Old. The North used what might be described as a liberal, modernistic interpretation; the South denied the existence of any authority in religious matters other than the Bible, and it insisted on word for word literalism. Although a very small part of the Bible was marshaled in the slavery controversy, the vehemence and volume of the dispute were so great that there seemed to be sectional differences in interpreting the entire Book. The South became convinced that it was adhering to the strict letter of religious law. Its attitude toward the Bible was like its attitude toward the Constitution; it claimed to respect the form of the law in both cases, and it charged the North with disregard for Christian as well as constitutional law.<sup>5</sup>

The apologists of the Old South seem to have exhausted their legal energies interpreting and defending the Constitution and the Bible, for they wrote very little about the Southerner's attitude toward the body of common and statutory law that regulates man's daily relations with

<sup>4</sup> For a convenient summary of the scriptural defense of slavery, see William S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 200-41.

<sup>5</sup> Although theological trends current in North and South probably accounted for some of the differences between the pronouncements of northern and southern theologians concerning slavery, it is not improbable that the slavery controversy in turn accentuated the divergence between the theological thinking of the two sections.

man. Because of this lack of a body of expressed opinion, other indices must be sought. An important indication of attitude is, of course, action; and, according to a number of witnesses, the Southerner's life was made exciting by a high proportion of street fights, duels, harsh treatment of slaves, quickness to resent insults, and the common practice of carrying pistols and other weapons.<sup>6</sup> But it is unwise to accept all this evidence as unqualified proof of southern lawlessness. Some Southerners have been known to give free reign to imagination when entertaining gullible strangers, and antisouthern abolitionists have shown equal and less innocent inventiveness in circulating atrocity stories concerning the land of slavery. Because of these streams of misinformation it is difficult to tell whether the Southerner acted more or less lawlessly than other Americans.

Waiving any attempt to determine the Southerner's attitude toward state law by the quantity of his illegal acts, there yet remain certain forces that must be reckoned with. In the first place, the South doubtless inherited its share of the frontier trait of personal law enforcement, which is sometimes called lawlessness. Some parts of it had been settled less than a generation when the Civil War began, while older settlements in pine barrens and mountain coves were in a sense retarded frontiers, relatively out of reach of sheriff and court. But in this respect the South was not unique. The frontier is supposed to have a lawless effect on all American society, and, generally speaking, the South at any given time was neither nearer to nor farther from the frontier than other parts of the United States. It is therefore difficult to suppose that the South had inherited more than its share of frontier lawlessness.

But what of those parts of the South where the frontier influence had faded into the relatively distant past, areas such as the Carolina

<sup>6</sup> A number of citations in proof of the above statement are marshaled in Avery Craven, "The 'Turner Theories' and the South," in *Journal of Southern History*, V (1939), 305-307. Additional evidence is available in William H. Russell, *My Diary North and South*, 2 vols. (New York, 1863), II, 7-11; [Augustus B. Longstreet], *Georgia Scenes* (Augusta, 1835); James S. Buckingham, *The Slaves States of America*, 2 vols. (London, 1842), II, 3-4; George W. Pierson, *Tocqueville and Beaumont in America* (New York, 1938), 640, 642; "South Carolina Morals," in *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston, 1857-), XXXIX (1877), 467-68.

low country, tidewater Virginia, the Kentucky bluegrass, and the lower Mississippi Valley, where age and conservatism and the accumulation of economic wealth and of political influence had created the way of life that has been accepted as most typical of the Old South? Were the legal attitudes of these plantation regions different from those of the commercial, industrial, and urban areas that symbolized northern progress? I think the answer must be affirmative because ruralness, slavery, the plantation system, and the existence of a strong unwritten code operated in the plantation areas of the Old South to restrict the power of ordinary law and to enlarge the area of life in which man acts without reference to legal guidance. This is to say that the segment of life that was controlled by law was reduced in these dominant regions of the Old South; it is not equivalent to saying that law, within its restricted zone, was held in disrespect. Nevertheless, one can readily understand how a citizen of another civilization could fall into the error of thinking that law was held in disrespect because its jurisdiction was not as large as he was accustomed to in his own community. But before generalizing it will be well to consider the influence of these forces on law and legal attitudes.

Ruralness was not considered the equivalent of backwardness by the Southerner, who might have summed up his ideal of social progress in the phrase "from frontier to plantation." In the realm of ideas as well as in actuality, the acme of southern civilization was rural. It is generally accepted that the countryman is something of an individualist who shapes his actions according to local custom and his own notions of how he should behave rather than according to the dictates of law books. Like the frontiersman, he is physically remote from law-enforcing agencies. If it be true that ruralness lightens the weight of law, the South was subjected to this influence not only because of the high per cent of its agricultural population but also because of the prominence of countrymen in economic, social, and political life. Furthermore, the planters probably had less contact with commercial law than did the business men of the cities. The reading of extant plantation records and communications between planters and factors makes one wonder

whether any other business of equal size has been run with as few precise records and as little commercial and legal paper as was the southern plantation.

Slavery also affected legal customs and attitudes. Although attention is being directed in this paper to those years shortly before the Civil War, when the southern mind had long felt the influence of distinctive southern institutions, it is significant that the influence of slavery upon those who owned slaves was recognized very early. It was the opinion of eighteenth century observers that the introduction of slavery had made Virginians "haughty and jealous of their liberties, and so impatient of restraint that they could hardly bear the thought of being controlled by any superior power."<sup>7</sup> George Mason, one of the wisest sons of Old Virginia, declared in the Federal Constitutional Convention that "every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant."<sup>8</sup> According to Thomas Nelson Page, the Virginia gentleman was imbued with "a certain pride based on self-respect and consciousness of power."<sup>9</sup> Horace S. Fulkerson, who was thoroughly familiar with life in the lower Mississippi Valley, stated that the planters of that region were "arbitrary, self-willed, and dictatorial," and that even from their equals "they could illy brook contradictions and opposition."<sup>10</sup> And Alexis de Tocqueville concluded that slavery "has modified the character and changed the habits of the natives of the South. . . . The citizen of the Southern States of the Union is invested with a sort of domestic dictatorship, from his earliest years; the first notion he acquires in life is that he is born to command."<sup>11</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *The Planters of Colonial Virginia* (Princeton, 1922), 155, thus summarizes the opinions of Robert Beverley, Jr., John F. D. Smyth, Hugh Jones, Thomas Anburey, Philip Fithian, and other eighteenth century writers.

<sup>8</sup> Henry D. Gilpin (ed.), *Papers of James Madison*, 3 vols. (Washington, 1840), III, 1391.

<sup>9</sup> "Social Life in Old Virginia," in *The Novels, Stories, Sketches and Poems of Thomas Nelson Page*, 18 vols. (New York, 1906-1918), XII, 188-89.

<sup>10</sup> Horace S. Fulkerson, *Random Recollections of Early Days in Mississippi* (Vicksburg, 1885), 15, 16, 144.

<sup>11</sup> Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. by Henry Reeve, 2 vols. (New York, 1900), I, 400. See also, Daniel R. Hundley, *Social Relations in Our Southern States* (New York, 1860), 70-71; and Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* (Philadelphia, 1794), 236-38.

Slavery must have affected the planter's attitude toward law, for in a measure slavery put him above the law. On his own estate he was lawgiver, executive, and judge. In respect to the economic and social life of his slaves—work, food, clothing, housing, marriage, divorce, and religion—his word was final. He possessed the power normally exercised by the state in many kinds of cases, such as slander, assault and battery, larceny, and burglary. Law books gave him no guidance in settling important questions. But this silence of the law does not seem to have disturbed him, for even when it spoke clearly the slaveholder sometimes paid no heed. For example, if a slave stabbed a Negro belonging to another master, the neighboring planters might settle the difficulty without going to any court.<sup>12</sup> This illustrates the fact that the slaveowner, while exercising the great power granted to him by the state, sometimes took yet more power. Occasionally the state even gave its blessing to such encroachments upon the state law. The South Carolina Court of Appeals once remarked, " 'A judicious freedom in the administration of our police laws for the lower order must always have respect for the confidence which the law reposes in the discretion of the master.' " <sup>13</sup> A disapproving Southerner summed up the whole process by saying that slavery was " 'degrading the law by putting the authority of the master above it.' " <sup>14</sup> This was correct, for southern states left the slaveowner free to exercise some of the powers that usually belong to the state, and even where there was law the planter sometimes either paid it scant attention or interpreted it with marked liberality.

<sup>12</sup> Charles S. Sydnor, *A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region: Benjamin L. C. Wailes* (Durham, 1938), 107.

<sup>13</sup> Quoted in Ulrich B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery* (New York, 1918), 502. Further evidence of the great power of the master over his slave, and of the state's recognition of this power, can be found in cases summarized in Helen T. Catterall (ed.), *Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the Negro*, 5 vols. (Washington, 1926-1937), I, 150; II, 516-17; and in George M. Stroud, *A Sketch of the Laws Relating to Slavery* (Philadelphia, 1856), 55-71; William Goodell, *The American Slave Code in Theory and Practice* (New York, 1853), 32-34, 126, 167-68.

<sup>14</sup> Quoted in Bell I. Wiley, *Southern Negroes, 1861-1865* (New Haven, 1938), 170. See also, Hundley, *Social Relations*, 185.

The fact that Negroes could not bear witness against white men<sup>15</sup> excluded a large number of cases from the courts of the South; in such instances reparation had to be sought, if sought at all, beyond the pale of law. As the critics of slavery pointed out, this rule compelled Negroes to suffer illegal treatment in silence.<sup>16</sup> Less often recalled is the fact that white men, both individually and as a social order, suffered unredressed injuries because of this prohibition. For example, a tobacco planter might have a part of his crop stolen by the white boatman to whom it had been entrusted for transportation from Lynchburg to Richmond, and the boatman's Negro assistants might tell all that had happened; yet, the planter knew that it would be useless to enter suit because the Negroes could not testify in court against the white thief.<sup>17</sup> Similarly, when a Mississippi slave was dangerously wounded by a white man, his master could not get legal redress either for his slave's physical suffering or for his own economic loss unless he could secure some evidence other than the word of the wounded Negro.<sup>18</sup> If Negroes and white men joined in an insurrectionary plot, as they did in Louisiana in 1840, and if the conspirators were discovered and frightened into testifying against each other, the courts could sentence the slaves to death. In fact, at least three were executed. But because Negro testimony could not be admitted by the court, the white conspirators could not be convicted.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Much evidence of the inacceptability of Negro testimony can be found in Stroud, *Laws Relating to Slavery*, 106, 110; Goodell, *American Slave Code*, 300-301; Thomas R. Cobb, *An Inquiry into the Law of Negro Slavery in the United States of America* (Philadelphia, 1858), 226-34.

<sup>16</sup> Because the Negro had so little direct influence in shaping the policies of the Old South, no attempt has been made to discover what he thought and did in consequence of his partial exclusion from the courts. But it may be noted that the distance between the Negro and the courts continues to be wide, a condition which has important effects. Comments on current extralegal aspects of Negro life can be found in Hortense Powdermaker, *After Freedom: A Cultural Study in the Deep South* (New York, 1939), 126, 173.

<sup>17</sup> *Richmond Enquirer*, March 7, 1826, quoted in Joseph C. Robert, *The Tobacco Kingdom* (Durham, 1938), 56.

<sup>18</sup> Sydnor, *Benjamin L. C. Wailes*, 108.

<sup>19</sup> The white men were flogged and ordered to leave the state. To accomplish their punishment, society had shifted from the court to lynch law. *Niles' Weekly Register* (Baltimore, 1811-1849), LIX (1840), 39, 88. See also, Hundley, *Social Relations*, 229.

The Southerner likewise avoided the use of Negro testimony in ecclesiastical and

These are three instances of the kinds of injuries that white men and white society could not redress through court action because the available testimony was not admitted to the courtroom. When it is remembered that one third of the South's population was thus incompetent, one may well suppose that a multitude of similar injuries created a constant urge toward the discovery of some means, which had to be extralegal, for securing substantial justice. Thus, the exclusion of Negro testimony, the rural pattern of life, the great authority of the planter, and, as will be noted presently, certain characteristics of the southern social order, and its code, all united to restrict the segment of life ruled by state law,<sup>20</sup> thereby creating within the South, even in the oldest and most cultivated parts of it, an attitude toward law that was much like that of the frontiersman. Geographical distance kept the full force of the law from touching the Westerner; the social order diminished the force of law in the South. But the resulting attitudes toward law were too similar for easy distinction. For instance, was Andrew Jackson's mother speaking from a western or a southern pattern of thought when she gave her son the following advice: "'Never tell a lie, nor take what is not your own, nor sue anybody for slander or assault and battery. *Always settle them cases yourself!*"'<sup>21</sup>

How did the Southerner's attitude toward the laws of his state compare with his insistence upon a literal, close observance of the Constitution and the Bible? While he did not profess disrespect for state law,

academic courts. Examples can be found in Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the General Conference, 1840* (New York, 1844), 28, 57, 87, 88 (Silas Comfort case); and *Record of the Testimony and Proceedings, in the Matter of the Investigation by the Trustees of the University of Mississippi, on the 1st and 2nd of March, 1860, of the Charges Made by H. R. Branham, against the Chancellor of the University* (Jackson, Miss., 1860). Disciplinary duties and troubles frequently plagued presidents and teachers in colleges of the Old South. This condition may have been caused in part by the fact that the misdoings of college boys could not be reported by such of the employees as were Negroes.

<sup>20</sup> An Alabama lawyer in 1832 advanced yet another explanation of disrespect for law in the Southwest. He believed that "Our magistracy is completely incapable, the mass of the people feel it as well as we," and he thought that this condition had been caused by the choice of judges by legislatures or popular votes rather than by the older system of executive appointment. Pierson, *Tocqueville and Beaumont in America*, 640.

<sup>21</sup> W. H. Sparks, *The Memories of Fifty Years* (Philadelphia, 1870), 148.

neither did he praise it. The planter simply went through life under the assumption that a relatively large number of his deeds had to be performed out past the margin of written law in what might be called a state of nature. To northern eyes this condition looked like an approach to anarchy and chaos; but planters thought their actions were no more lawless than the operations of a court of equity.<sup>22</sup> Although it might be debated whether the Southerner's life was much better or worse than contemporary life in the most litigious parts of New England, it is more profitable at the moment to remark that the extralegal, though usually not illegal, areas of life in the South convinced many onlookers that here was a land where law was frequently broken and commonly held in contempt. It is not surprising that these observers were puzzled by the contrast between the Southerner's reverence for the Constitution and the Bible and his apparent disdain for some of the laws of his state.

In those relatively large expanses of life that were not ruled by the written law the Southerner did not live in a legal vacuum. Instead he found guidance, particularly in the field of personal relationships, in a fourth kind of law: his unwritten code. Some of the sources of this body of compulsive rules were ideas of social organization imported into Virginia and the Carolinas by colonists who were familiar with the pattern of life of the English gentry of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries;<sup>23</sup> contacts with the military punctilio of French and British army officers, especially at the time of the American Revolution;<sup>24</sup> the remembrance of chivalric ballads;<sup>25</sup> the reading of romantic novels such as those of Sir Walter Scott;<sup>26</sup> and the tradition, which evolved

<sup>22</sup> In judging how men would behave in a state of nature, the North seems to have followed Hobbes and the South, Rousseau.

<sup>23</sup> William E. Dodd, "The Emergence of the First Social Order in the United States," in *American Historical Review*, XL (1935), 217-31.

<sup>24</sup> Dixon R. Fox, *Ideas in Motion* (New York, 1935), 58-59.

<sup>25</sup> Arthur P. Hudson, *Folksongs of Mississippi and Their Background* (Chapel Hill, 1936), 32-34.

<sup>26</sup> William E. Dodd, *The Cotton Kingdom* (New Haven, 1919), 81; Hamilton J. Eckenrode, "Sir Walter Scott and the South," in *North American Review* (Boston, New York, 1815-), CCVI (1917), 595-603.

in later years, that southern planters were descended from the aristocracy of Europe and should therefore live in the manner of their legendary ancestors.<sup>27</sup> In addition to these European heritages and influences, the social customs and mores of the Old South were affected by vestiges of the frontier practice of personal law enforcement and by certain characteristics of the planters. They were a dominant class, they were accustomed to the exercise of great authority, and some of them had the means to live like aristocrats. In parts of the Old South, more than anywhere else in the United States, countrymen had the wealth requisite for living on a high level of civilization.

A thorough understanding of the code of the Old South is difficult for several reasons. It has been much romanticized, especially by post-bellum writers of fiction and memoirs, it varied somewhat from place to place, its tenets were not the same for all classes of society, it suffered infractions like other laws, and it was too complex to be learned except by a lifetime of living under its sway. It is possible that those who knew it best did not explain it because they thought it would survive longer if the uninitiated were left in their ignorance. When Thomas Nelson Page wrote: "To be a Virginia gentleman was the first duty; it embraced being a Christian and all the other virtues,"<sup>28</sup> he was suggesting the existence of knowledge rather than revealing it. An old family retainer once condemned a recently employed tutor with the remark: "Lord, what sort of a man is this master is got to teach his children! He don't even know how to get on a horse!" Now, although riding a horse was not in itself supremely important, it was an outward symbol of a way of life. The old Negro's remark was but a way of saying that this tutor was ignorant of other things that were exceedingly important. As one of the pupils later remarked more directly but no more informatively about this pedestrian teacher, he was "very ignorant of a thousand things we thought a gentleman ought to know."<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Hundley, *Social Relations*, 27; "South Carolina Society," in *Atlantic Monthly*, XXXIX (1877), 670-72.

<sup>28</sup> Page, "Social Life in Old Virginia," in *loc. cit.*, 189.

<sup>29</sup> Delia B. Page, *Recollections of Home for My Brothers and Children* (Richmond, 1903), 56.

While each of the social groups in the Old South had customs and rules of conduct, the code became more complex and emphatic among the planters and their associates. Here was a relatively small group of men maintaining a superior position out of all proportion to their numerical power. They were not only claiming and holding a place of economic, social, and racial superiority above the millions of Negro slaves, but economic and to some extent social superiority above the poor whites, small farmers, artisans, and schoolteachers. Furthermore, they were exercising in national councils greater power than the population of the South warranted.

Each of these superior positions was held in the face of a constant threat by the subordinate forces. The planter class could have been destroyed by revolt of the slaves, by votes of the nonslaveholding Southerners, or by the North. Nor were the planters blind to these dangers. The potential hostility held them together and required each member to defend the group and to conceal dissensions within it from envious and critical eyes. Self-interest as well as *noblesse oblige* required the planter to live in accordance with certain unwritten rules.<sup>80</sup>

Although it is impossible to state the code of the Old South with either fullness or precision, and although the code was imperfectly obeyed, perhaps some of its rules should be set forth because, being the ideals of a society, they indicate something of the nature of that society. Among the things that a gentleman of the Old South was expected to be, to understand, and to perform were these.<sup>81</sup> He must uphold the southern way of life by close observance of a complex body

<sup>80</sup> It is significant that Tocqueville, when contrasting the manners and concepts of honor of Americans with those prevailing among aristocracies, remarked: "I speak here of the Americans inhabiting those States where slavery does not exist; they alone can be said to present a complete picture of democratic society." *Democracy in America*, II, 246, and 181, 227, 244-47, 250-53. Napoléon Achille Murat considered Virginians "the only real aristocrats of the Union" even though they "boasted much of democracy" and were "coarse, vain, and haughty." *A Moral and Political Sketch of the United States of North America* (London, 1833), 11-14. See also, "The Political Condition of South Carolina," in *Atlantic Monthly*, XXXIX (1877), 188-89.

<sup>81</sup> Discussions of the manners and code of the Old South can be found in Benjamin B. Kendrick and Alex M. Arnett, *The South Looks at Its Past* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 26-35; Hundley, *Social Relations*, 27-74; "South Carolina Morals," in *loc. cit.*, 467-68, 471-72; *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition* (New York, 1930).

of rules of social and racial relationships. For example, even when performing acts of kindness to subordinates, familiarity must be shunned. Toward an equal a gentleman should be courteous. He professed no knowledge of how to behave toward superiors, for he denied the existence of any with the exception of the ladies. To these he must show perfect courtesy and always defer to their opinions. The gentleman's deference, however, was protected from too great strain because the ladies were expected to avoid expressing opinions on all subjects, such as politics, that lay in the realm of masculine jurisdiction.

Believing that southern life was well-nigh perfect, a southern gentleman was under no compulsion to change things. From this it followed that he had no public duty other than to keep society going in its accustomed way. Lacking the New Englander's zeal for improvement and reform, he could enjoy rest with a clear conscience. Thus it is that the Southerner was the only American of his and possibly any generation to whom leisure was not a sin. He was interested in being rather than in becoming. He thought it was more important in the business world for a man to maintain poise than to sacrifice dignity for wealth. Increasing mortgages and other evidences of economic failure were no disgrace even when brought about by gross inattention to business. According to his code it was bad form to intrude business matters into social life as by boasting of hard work in pursuit of wealth or by discussing money and prices except of such quasipublic commodities as cotton, tobacco, and slaves. When his leisureliness and contentment with things-as-they-were were characterized as laziness, he countered by scorning the aimless bustle and hurry of urban life.<sup>32</sup> There was satire rather than kindly humor in his remark that New Englanders could not wear frock coats because they whisked around corners so fast the tails were snapped off.

The southern gentleman was expected to be truthful, an obligation that was not difficult of fulfillment by one who denied being accountable to superiors. The code required him to be brave, and skilled in

<sup>32</sup> "Southern and Northern Civilization Contrasted," in *Russell's Magazine* (Charleston, 1857-1860), I (1857), 102-105.

managing horses and handling firearms. He must be willing to risk life itself in defense of his own good name or that of a member of his family.<sup>88</sup> As long as the Old South lived, duels were fought despite criticism by prominent Southerners, abuse of the institution by adventurers, and a decline in dueling elsewhere in the United States.

The nondemocratic form of southern society was partly responsible for the survival of the duel, which is a phenomenon of aristocratic rather than democratic societies. Men may fight on the frontiers of Texas or California before law has arrived in full force. But these combats in the democratic society of the frontier are usually not conducted according to the code duello. In contrast, the duel is usually found in the upper classes of a complex society; it is found not in the broad base of the social pyramid but in the small apex—landed gentry, feudal barons, army officers—that towers above the cloud of laws that blanket and hold in place the lower orders. Therefore, gentlemen would challenge only gentlemen. To punish an insulting inferior, one used not a pistol or sword but a cane or a horsewhip.

In the practice of the duel certain cardinal ideas were implicit. First, a man's good name was more important than physical well-being, which is to say that in the South it was considered as brutal and uncivilized to call a man a liar as it was to bruise or cut his body. Secondly, questions of personal honor and integrity could not be decided by the judicial processes of democratic government; hence, slander, libel, and some other indignities could be better adjudicated with pistols in a quiet grove in the presence of only a few gentlemen than in the courtroom before a jury of small farmers, clerks, and mechanics. Furthermore, since the duel was restricted to gentlemen, a challenge carried along with its danger a certain recognition of social superiority and responsibility.

<sup>88</sup> Several of the southern states have retained even to this day statutes under which insult may justifiably be answered by physical force. Such statutes, of course, abrogate the common law rule that insulting language is no defense to an action for assault. Wex S. Malone, "Insult in Retaliation—the Huckabee Case," *Mississippi Law Journal* (Jackson, 1928-), XI (1939), 333-39, especially 338; *Huckabee v. Nash*, 183 *Southern Reporter* 500 (Miss. 1938).

The fighting of duels and the imposition of other penalties sanctioned by the code was indeed looked upon as something of a social responsibility. A man fought because society demanded that certain issues be so adjudicated; and if one refused to obey this social demand, society would apply such complete ostracism that the offender would "never again be permitted to join gentlemen even in a fox hunt. He's utterly out of it."<sup>84</sup> Doubtless many a man decided that he must fight because he was conscious of this social pressure. The upper crust of society demanded the duel because it dared not submit all of its controversies to the adjudication of a democracy.<sup>85</sup>

This characteristic of the Old South, namely, that a man was conscious of belonging to and being a part of a thing larger than himself, has impressed such novelists as John Esten Cooke, Thomas Nelson Page, George Cary Eggleston, Joseph Hergesheimer, Stark Young, and Ellen Glasgow more than it has historians. It is natural that novelists should be sensitive to the organic nature of southern society because, as Henry Seidel Canby has written in an essay about Miss Glasgow: "The great subject for the novel since its beginning in the eighteenth century has been manners, and when the novels have been also great these manners have been no superficialities of behavior, but a code, a habitual philosophy of living according to which men and women proceed."<sup>86</sup>

<sup>84</sup> George C. Eggleston, *The Warrens of Virginia* (New York, 1908), 31.

<sup>85</sup> There is no adequate study of dueling in the Old South, but the following citations show that duels were not infrequent and indicate something of southern opinion toward this custom: John L. Wilson, *The Code of Honor; or Rules for the Government of Principals and Seconds in Duelling* (Charleston, 1858); Lorenzo Sabine, *Notes on Duels and Duelling* (Boston, 1855); Thomas Gamble, *Savannah Duels and Duellists, 1733-1877* (Savannah, 1923); Fulkerson, *Random Recollections of Early Days in Mississippi*, 44-49; *Russell's Magazine*, I (1857), 132-42, 439-54; Don C. Seitz, *Famous American Duels* (New York, 1929); Robert R. Howison, "Duelling in Virginia," in *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (Williamsburg, 1892-), Ser. II, Vol. IV (1924), 217-44; Isaac M. Patridge, "The Press of Mississippi—Historical Sketch," in *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), XXIX (1860), 505-507; Francis P. Gaines, *The Southern Plantation* (New York, 1924), 159.

<sup>86</sup> Henry S. Canby, "Ellen Glasgow: Ironie Tragedian," in *Saturday Review of Literature* (New York, 1924-), XVIII, No. 20, p. 3 (September 10, 1938).

The Southerner's sense of being part of a differentiated society had many effects. For example, he was conscious of family relationships; kinship was one way of telling where a man belonged. The letter of introduction was more than a social formality; the writer

This sense of belonging to a definitely ordered society may have been the reason why Southerners were the first Americans to make much use of the word "sociology."<sup>87</sup> But most of the citizens of the Old South instead of speculating about the nature of their society found their places within it and lived in harmony with its conventions. Naturally, those who enjoyed the favored places in society were most opposed to change. Their supreme patriotism was to their social order. Their highest law was the body of customs and rules that maintained this way of life. This was their code; this was the unwritten constitution of the Old South.

Most of the actions required of the Southerner by his code were the host of undistinguished and innocuous deeds that make up the fabric of everyday life. But now and again the code required a man to requite a personal insult either by a duel or by some less ceremonious form of violence. This tendency to defend personal honor extralegally, and indeed illegally, seems to have been more prevalent in the South than in the North; it does not necessarily follow that Northerners were more prone to take such questions into court. Although Northerners declared that dueling was proof of southern lawlessness, Southerners who approved this custom reasoned otherwise. Their statement of the case might be reconstructed as follows: in case of insult the code of honor required action; the state code enjoined submission. Here was a conflict of law. Therefore, the individual had to decide which body of law applied to the case, and if he decided in favor of the code of honor he was simply transferring the case from state jurisdiction to the jurisdiction of the unwritten code.

What then is the meaning of the Southerner's legal attitudes? In the first place, they were reflections of important aspects of southern history. They might be described as rationalizations in legal terms of fundamental of such a letter assumed much responsibility. In estimating a man's worth, the Southerner was prone to give great weight to personal endorsements.

<sup>87</sup> Henry Hughes, *Treatise on Sociology, Theoretical and Practical* (Philadelphia, 1854); George Fitzhugh, *Sociology for the South; or, the Failure of Free Society* (Richmond, 1854); L. L. Bernard, "Henry Hughes, First American Sociologist," in *Journal of Social Forces* (Chapel Hill, 1922-), XV (1937), 154-74; *id.*, "The Historic Pattern of Sociology in the South," *ibid.*, XVI (1938), 1-12.

mental southern interests both national and local. The Southerner's attitude toward the Constitution and the Bible was produced by his conflict with the North over slavery and kindred issues. His attitudes toward the written laws of the state and the unwritten code evolved out of southern domestic history. For instance, the occasional conflict between these two imperatives over questions of honor may be viewed as a product of the struggle of an aristocratic social order to maintain its position and power against the enlarging power of the democracy; a conflict of laws arose where the customs of the few clashed with the laws of the many.<sup>88</sup>

In the second place, the Southerner's set of legal attitudes distinguished him to some extent from other Americans. The Northerner, for example, living in a different social system and possessing dissimilar economic goals from those of the South, arranged the imperatives in a totally different order. To him a literal interpretation of the biblical sanctions of slavery and of the constitutional sanctions of slavery and of state rights were undesirable; to him the meaning and the potency of the code were incomprehensible; but, on the other hand, he emphasized the sanctity of ordinary law because of its importance in the equalitarian democracy of the North.

In the third place, the Southerner did not defend all forms of law with equal vigor nor did he place them all on the same level of importance. Neither did the Northerner. But here the similarity ends; for in deciding which bodies of law deserved literal interpretation and strict application and which ought to be loosely interpreted and imperfectly enforced, North and South were in complete disagreement. Because men of both sections praised certain laws, all could consider themselves as law-abiding and therefore good men; but because they disagreed over the laws that ought to be given most respect, each thought that the other was peopled with lawless and therefore bad men.

<sup>88</sup> Similarly, during the Civil War the code of the gentleman sometimes clashed with military discipline. The gentleman in the ranks saw nothing improper in giving advice to his commanding officer especially when the military hierarchy was contrary to the social hierarchy. It was said that in Richmond from the President on down there was a morbid sensitiveness on the subject of personal dignity. George C. Eggleston, *A Rebel's Recollections* (New York, 1897), 31-36, 222.

To the Northerner the Southerner seemed to be dishonest, and the reverse was also true, because each was boasting of his respect for some laws while he was actually showing disrespect for other laws. Naturally, then, each concluded that it was futile to continue negotiations with a people who refused to respect legal obligations. By such means sectional differences in legal attitudes became something more than passive reflections of basic divergencies; these attitudes became active in increasing the antagonism between the sections.<sup>89</sup>

Examples of sectional differences in legal attitudes can be seen in a number of critical points in American history. For instance, when John C. Calhoun framed his powerful proslavery resolutions for presentation in the Senate in 1837 he was conscious of the fact that slavery could be and indeed was being judged by reference to several different authorities such as divine law, the moral law, and the Constitution. In his resolutions he therefore insisted that congressional legislation respecting slavery in the territories and in the District of Columbia should be framed with reference solely to the Constitution and that considerations of its alleged sinfulness or immorality should be excluded. The implications of this pronouncement could be discussed at much length, but such a discussion would be a digression from the point that is here of most significance. Calhoun was saying, in effect, that Federal legislation must be framed with reference to no more than one ultimate authority which was neither moral law nor divine law but the Constitution of the United States.<sup>90</sup>

One other illustration must suffice, and it will consist in a hurried review of the Brooks-Sumner affair. The first part of this sensational episode was a speech delivered in the Senate on May 19-20, 1856, by Charles Sumner, senator from Massachusetts, denouncing slaveowners in general and South Carolinians in particular. It was a studiously learned speech, replete with classical and historical allusions; at the

<sup>89</sup> Sectional differences in customs and attitudes sometimes made it difficult for northern and southern men to understand each other's behavior as individuals. For example, Henry Adams liked his Harvard classmate "Roony" Lee, the son of Robert E. Lee, but he could not understand him. Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams* (Boston, 1930), 57-58.

<sup>90</sup> *Congressional Globe*, 25 Cong., 2 Sess., 55 (December 27, 1837).

same time it abounded in such coarse and opprobrious terms as harlot, mistress, rape, pirate, tyrant, falsifier, assassin, thug, swindler, and criminal. Much of the abuse was directed personally to Andrew Pickens Butler, senior senator from South Carolina, who was absent from the Senate while Sumner was making his attack. Certain aspects of this speech are significant. Sumner grossly and without provocation insulted Butler; in so doing he acted deliberately, for he had prepared his speech carefully with the purpose of making it "the most thorough philippic ever uttered in a legislative body";<sup>41</sup> finally, he was accusing slaveholders of being lawless.

The sequel to this tirade occurred two days later. Following an early adjournment, Sumner remained in the Senate chamber writing letters when Preston S. Brooks, a congressman from South Carolina, walked up to him and said: "Mr. Sumner, I have read your speech carefully, and with as much calmness as I could be expected to read such a speech. You have libeled my State, and slandered my relation, who is aged and absent, and I feel it to be my duty to punish you for it." Thereupon, with a cane, he struck Sumner over the head, and he continued with rapid, hard blows until the cane was broken and Sumner was bloody and insensible. This action of Brooks also deserves close scrutiny. Deliberation rather than quick anger is indicated by the fact that after hearing oral reports of Sumner's speech he took time to examine the printed record, he discussed the question with his friends, and he sought, though vainly, an encounter outside the Senate chamber. During the two days that were thus consumed he seems to have felt no uncertainty as to whether he should punish Sumner, nor is there an indication that he at any time considered challenging him to a duel. He felt that he ought not to call Sumner to account in the presence of ladies, and because some were present in the Senate gallery he waited until they departed before attacking Sumner. A question to which he gave some thought was whether he should use horsewhip, cowhide, or cane, all of which were weapons of dishonor. Citizens of Massachusetts, judging

<sup>41</sup> George H. Haynes, "Charles Sumner," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XVIII, 208-14. See also, James E. Walmsley, "Preston Smith Brooks," *ibid.*, III, 88.

from their subsequent remarks, did not understand as thoroughly as did South Carolinians the delicate shades of meaning implicit in Brooks decisions.<sup>42</sup>

Undoubtedly, the Brooks-Sumner affair was an expression of the angry passions of 1856 and a forerunner of yet more hatred in the years to come. But it was more than this, for the form in which anger is expressed often indicates much about the characteristics of the actor and about the mores of the society in which he lives. Brooks and Sumner were each viewed by their respective constituencies as worthy representatives: Sumner of the culture and learning of Massachusetts; Brooks of the chivalry of South Carolina. Following this encounter, the part that each had played was applauded by his people. The words "lawful" and "lawless" seemed to change their meaning as one crossed the boundary between North and South; for acts that the Northerner branded as lawless were approved by South Carolinians, words that the Southerner considered lawless met with no apparent disapproval in Massachusetts.

While peoples of all ages have faced the alternative of the ancient Hebrews: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve,"<sup>43</sup> this question presented itself on certain occasions to individual men in the Old South. At such times those who had never worn judicial robes had to decide which of the various imperatives they ought to obey, and at these moments of decision they often acted as if every man had been empowered to act as a court of last resort for determining certain types of questions. Perhaps, then, it was fitting that the Southerner should have found the issue of 1861 stated in the form of legal alternatives. The ordinances of secession placed the laws of state and of nation in such diametric opposition that no man could obey both. Facing this great conflict of laws each Southerner assumed full power of judicial review and rendered his own decision as to which law he should obey.

<sup>42</sup> Data about the Brooks-Sumner affair can be found by consulting the index of the *Cong. Globe*, 34 Cong., 1 Sess., Pt. II. On pages 1349-50 (June 2, 1856) is the version quoted above of Brook's statement to Sumner. The text of Sumner's speech is in *ibid.*, Appendix, 529-44 (May 19-20, 1856). See also, his remarks to Stephen A. Douglas in *ibid.*, 547 (May 20, 1856); and "Statement of Preston S. Brooks," in Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings* (Boston, 1859-), LXI (1928), 221-23.

<sup>43</sup> Joshua 24:15.

# The Economic Basis of Society in the Late Ante-Bellum South

BY FRANK L. AND HARRIET C. OWSLEY

The picture of the late ante-bellum South had become stereotyped by 1861.<sup>1</sup> Northern and foreign, notably English, travelers had written a considerable body of literature dealing with the South during the period of the slavery controversy and, with few exceptions, these travelers and commentators were agreed that the rural population was divided into three social and economic classes: slaveholders, "poor whites," and Negroes. The slaveholders were somehow thought of in terms of great planters who lived like nabobs in white-columned mansions. They were the great monopolists of their day: they crowded everyone else off the good lands and even off the lands from which modest profits might be realized; they dominated politics, religion, and all phases of public life. The six or seven million nonslaveholders who composed the other portion of the free population of the South were thought of as "poor whites," who had been pushed off into the pine barrens and the sterile sand hills and mountains, where they lived in squalid log huts. They were illiterate, drunken outcasts for whom the social system of the slaveholders had no use, squatters upon the wornout lands of the planters or upon the government lands. Between the great unwashed and the slaveholders there was a chasm that could not be bridged, one that became greater with time. Everywhere the rich were getting richer and the poor were growing poorer.

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association at New Orleans, November 4, 1938. The writers wish to acknowledge the generous financial aid given by the Social Science Research Council for the purpose of carrying on research in the field of social and economic history of the late ante-bellum South.

George Weston, for example, wrote in 1856:

The whites of the South not connected with the ownership or management of slaves, constituting not far from three-fourths of the whole number of whites, confined at least to the low wages of agricultural labor, and partly cut off even from this by the degradation of a companionship with black slaves, retire to the outskirts of civilization, where they lead a semi-savage life, sinking deeper and more hopelessly into barbarism with each succeeding generation. The slave owner takes at first all the best lands, and finally all the lands susceptible of regular cultivation; and the poor whites, thrown back upon the hills and upon the sterile soils—mere squatters without energy enough to acquire the title even to the cheap lands they occupy, without roads, and at length, without even a desire for education, become the miserable beings described to us.<sup>2</sup>

The British writer, John E. Cairnes, expressed the opinion that "the constitution of a slave society . . . resolves itself into three classes, broadly distinguished from each other, and connected by no common interest—the slaves on whom devolves all the regular industry, the slave-holders who reap all its fruits, and an idle and lawless rabble who live dispersed over vast plains in a condition little removed from absolute barbarism."<sup>3</sup> These mean whites are the natural growth of the slave system; "regular industry is only known to them as the vocation of slaves, and it is the one fate which above all others they desire to avoid."<sup>4</sup> Frederick L. Olmsted was very decidedly of the opinion that the majority of the southern people were "poor whites" who lived in idleness because work was identified with slavery. "Whatever is associated with the slave as having been peculiarly attached to his condition," he wrote, was regarded with disfavor. "For manual agricultural labor, therefore, the free man looking on, has a contempt, and for its necessity in himself, if such necessity exists, a pity quite beyond that of the man under whose observations it has been free from such an association of ideas."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> George M. Weston, *The Poor Whites of the South* (Washington, 1856), 5. Weston was an eastern Democrat at that time.

<sup>3</sup> John E. Cairnes, *The Slave Power: Its Character, Career and Probable Designs* (London, 1862), 60.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 79.

<sup>5</sup> Frederick L. Olmsted, *A Journey in the Back Country* (New York, 1863), 299. Indeed, the entire writings of Olmsted concerning the South leave the impression that the mass of Southerners were "poor whites," and that the planters were frequently as

While slavery and the plantation system have been in the process of re-examination in the light of the new types of source material first utilized by Ulrich B. Phillips—that is, plantation records, private letters, diaries, and other such sources—little systematic attempt has been made to study the manner of life of those millions, both small slaveholder and nonslaveholder, who fell outside the plantation economy, and to fit these into the general economic and social structure of the South. That is to say, the large planter has received all the attention while the society of the Old South as a whole has been neglected. This neglect to restudy southern life except as manifested in the large planter class is probably due to two causes: first, an almost complete lack of personal letters and farm records of the nonslaveholder, the small slaveholder, and even the small planter; second, an assumption that the European and northern travel literature produced amid the slavery controversy and most frequently part of it, was, notwithstanding this fact, both objective and otherwise competent reporting. The result of the failure to reassess the chief material upon which the conception of the Old South was based in ante-bellum times is that the current conception of the Old South is essentially the stereotype of 1861.<sup>6</sup> That we should continue to know the old regime in the South through the eyes of those who traveled fast and saw only from an external point of view, and through the eyes of those who came with an unfriendly mission, must have seemed to all thoughtful students of southern history to be an act of faith out of keeping with scientific methods and historical criticism. Yet it has not been necessary to rely solely upon such sources for there has always existed a great body of objective historical material concerning not only the large planter class but also the entire white population from which a systematic and scientific study of the social and economic structure of the Old South could be made. This material con-

crude and ignorant as the "poor whites." See also, *id.*, *A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States* (New York, 1856), and *A Journey Through Texas* (New York, 1857).

<sup>6</sup> There are a great many students of history at the present time who doubt the validity of the picture of the Old South presented to the world by Olmsted and other such travelers. A lack of personal material, however, such as that left us by some of the large planters has discouraged a systematic study of the society of the South in its entirety.

sists of the county records and the court records of both state and Federal government. The county records are the most comprehensive and valuable, particularly if the unpublished Federal census reports are included. Long before the historian even suspected that the county records were the sources for social and economic history, the genealogists were systematically using and publishing this material in the older states. They correctly seized upon the will books, administration of estates, proceedings of orphans courts, minutes of the county courts, deed books, marriage records, tax books, and the unpublished Federal census returns as the most significant documents. Out of these, wills and administration of estates more than all other documents recreate the personal and family relationships in community life. It is this type of material, indeed, so personal and intimate in its nature, that goes far toward supplying a substitute for the private letters, diaries, farm records, and journals which, unlike the planter, the mass of people failed to preserve. For a statistical analysis of the population, the county tax lists and the unpublished Federal census returns furnish all the essential data.

Excerpts from wills illustrate the uses to which these documents may be put in recreating the life of those millions who have left few if any private and personal papers. Two nonslaveholders have been selected for this purpose since this class has left less personal, private documents than any others. The will of John Davidson of Dickson County, Tennessee, substantial farmer and owner of about three hundred acres of land, numerous horses and work stock, swine and cattle, is given in part:

In the name of God, Amen. I John Davidson Sen'r being of sound mind but in a low state as to health do make and publish this as my last will and testament. First I desire that all my debts be paid as soon as possible out of the first money that comes into the hands of my beloved wife or my executor. Second, as to what property we have we in the bond of affection have laboured for it lovingly we have enjoyed it and now with a glad heart do I will and bequeath all that I may die possessed of whether it be lands, crops of any kind, household and kitchen furniture or fowls of all kinds . . . to my beloved wife during her natural life or widowhood for the support of herself and family.

Following this he made numerous parting gifts to his adult children who already seem to have been given a portion of their inheritance as was the custom. Thus, this plain man of the Old South in simple eloquence of biblical style bade farewell to his beloved family and all his earthly possessions without a word of regret or complaint. Here was a man of substance, of considerable education, who, together with his family, did not regard labor in the fields as degrading.<sup>7</sup>

The will of Thomas Coy of Franklin County, Tennessee, bears the marks of tragedy. It was in the form of a personal letter to an intimate friend who had stood by Coy in need. One gets the impression that Coy was laboring under great mental stress brought on by what he considered an unjust accusation. His lack of literacy was made to seem even worse, perhaps, by this strain under which he labored. Coy was a man of some means. Excerpts from the will follow:

Friend Willick you and wife have bin to friends to me through adversity as well as prosperity and will prove my thankfulness to you for it it is no use to Raise my voice or to say a word in my defence i am condemned by all for unfaithfulness of friendship there was never any one more unjustly condemned to my best friends I leave my best respects Except the Boon I offer you there is about Fifteen hundred Dollars Give Ben Spyker my gun and watch the remainder keep yourself you will pay W Pryor for washing let Dr Borrough have my tools make it write with him Dock does not owe me anything perhaps I owe him something Keep all the rest yourself O you must pardon me for this vast act I cannot Buffet the waves any longer God knows there is nobody tries harder to do right than I do tell Martha I still think of her till death Martha you judged me wrong But I forgive you only misunderstood me fairwell to all for I am not mad at nobody God knows it Missis Spyker as a last token of my friendship for you except the small sum of five hundred Dollars from your unworthy friend Coy. I should have made you a much better present But I burnt it in a mistake a long with some letters and papers. Miss Spyker i am unjustly and ungreatfully [accused] i have not the strength of mind to [bear] it any longer. I am going to the Mountains there to wander the balance of my Days. I give Ben my watch Good Ben I bid you all goodby I am mad at none of you God knows it.\*

Poor Thomas Coy, who apparently had been falsely accused of unfaithfulness to his sweetheart, Martha, and who had been discarded by her

<sup>7</sup> Dickson County (Tennessee) Will Book, A, 140, WPA copy, 76.

<sup>8</sup> Franklin County (Tennessee) Will Book, I-II, 238, WPA copy, 274.

had only a short time to wander in the mountains, for his will was soon probated as a sign of his death.

While such documents endow the plain people with souls and bodies, they do not make possible a systematic study of the general structure of southern society. We know from wills and deeds, administration of estates, and other court records of a personal nature that there was a large body of nonslaveholders and small slaveholders who possessed lands, livestock, farm produce, and money in sufficient quantities to enable them to live comfortably. From such documents it is possible to make a case study of the plain people of the Old South as Phillips and his followers have done for the large planter class. But from this type of material it would never be practicable to determine the proportions of the several social and economic groups. The county tax lists, however, furnish a fairly good basis for statistical, quantitative analyses for all classes. Unfortunately, most tax books for this early period have been destroyed; but where still in existence they are not comparable with unpublished Federal census reports for quantitative analysis of the population and its economic life. Beginning in 1850 there were six schedules made up by the census takers: Free Inhabitants, Slave Inhabitants, Mortality Statistics, Productions of Agriculture, Productions of Industry, and Social Statistics. For the study of the agricultural population, Schedules I, II, and IV, that is, Free Inhabitants, Slave Inhabitants, and Productions of Agriculture, respectively, are the basic documents. Indeed, the Productions of Agriculture is a veritable doomsday book. In making this study it has been used as a master chart upon which data from the other two schedules have been superimposed. The Agricultural Schedule gives the name of practically every farmer, the amount of improved and unimproved land that he used, a detailed account of his livestock and farm productions of the previous year, his home manufactures and slaughtered animals. This schedule, however, does not as a rule indicate whether a person owned or rented his land or worked it on shares, nor does it indicate whether or not he was a slaveowner. The ownership of land and the total value of one's real estate—as well as his personal property—can be determined by check-

ing Schedule IV (Productions of Agriculture) against Schedule I (Free Inhabitants), while the ownership of slaves can be determined by checking Schedule IV against Schedule II (Slave Inhabitants). Eventually by making use of these three schedules in particular and others wherever desirable, almost complete data can be obtained concerning every individual family.<sup>9</sup>

On the basis of this technique several southern states are being examined particularly for the late ante-bellum period, and final conclusions on many phases of society may now be reached. As a general proposition it can be said that at no time before 1860 was the rural white population of the South divided into two great social classes, slaveholders and nonslaveholders. Quite on the contrary, the population was divided into many economic and social categories ranging from destitute "poor whites" to immensely rich planters. Despite the complex social structure of the white population, the great mass of the farming population, whether slaveholding or nonslaveholding, were middle-class people. Using a term common in colonial America and in England until the eighteenth century, it might be said that the bulk of the farming population of the South were yeomen. Numerous indices of well-being applied to the population signify that the bulk of the white people of the South—the yeomanry—enjoyed with the planters a high degree of social and economic security. Despite the unkept appearance of the backwoodsman, the shabby aspect of much of even the best countryside, despite, indeed, the panoramic impression of decadence gained by the travelers from outside the region, the basic indices point to the conclusion that the bulk of the southern whites were not only economically secure, but that on the whole their position was, when considered over a period of years, constantly improving.

The state of Alabama has been selected for analysis and illustration since it seems to be typical of the Lower South; and the farming popu-

\* In making the statistical analysis of the census data punchcards were used for all heads of families engaged in agriculture, and these cards were analyzed by an electric sorting machine.

lation will be used as the basis of analysis because Alabama was a rural state. Indeed, the entire South in 1860 was essentially rural, for even the towns were markets or places of residence for the well-to-do farmers and planters. One of the first indices of well-being in a farming population is the extent of landownership. Today, the black belt of Alabama and of the entire Lower South has 70 to 80 per cent landless farmers, a good portion of whom are whites. Before 1860 the reverse situation prevailed: landownership was widely diffused and was spreading rapidly. In analyzing the spread of landownership in Alabama before 1860—as well as examining the other indices of well-being—three regions have been selected as fairly typical of the state as a whole, namely, the piney woods, flats, and sand hills of South Alabama; the black belt stretching from east to west in a crescent across the state; and the piedmont lying above the black belt.<sup>10</sup>

First, let us examine the spread of landownership in the black belt. In Montgomery County 72 per cent of the farming population were landowners in 1850 and 76 per cent in 1860.<sup>11</sup> Marengo County increased in landownership among its farm population from 75 per cent in 1850 to 87 per cent in 1860. Bibb County, only part of which lies in the black belt, showed a slight increase in the spread of landownership in the last ten years before the Civil War: in 1850, 69 per cent of those engaged in agriculture and in 1860, 70 per cent were landowners.

<sup>10</sup> The Tennessee Valley region though examined in connection with this study is not included here because the Agricultural Schedule (IV) has been lost. The general property structure as seen in the other Schedules, however, appears to be about the same as that of the black belt both as to the spread of ownership and sizes of holdings.

<sup>11</sup> United States Census Reports, MSS., Schedule I, Free Inhabitants in the County of Montgomery, State of Alabama, 1850; Schedule II, Slave Inhabitants in the County of Montgomery, State of Alabama, 1850; Schedule IV, Productions of Agriculture in the County of Montgomery, State of Alabama, 1850; Schedule I, Free Inhabitants in the County of Montgomery, State of Alabama, 1860; Schedule II, Slave Inhabitants in the County of Montgomery, State of Alabama, 1860. All future references in this essay to the Federal Census will be to Schedules I, II, and IV for 1850, and to Schedules I and II for 1860. All the data with the exception of that for Greene and Dallas counties on which the analyses set forth in this paper are based were obtained from these above-named Schedules for each county under consideration. It will be unnecessary to repeat the citations. Schedules I and II are in the Census Office in Washington; Schedule IV, Productions of Agriculture for 1850, is in the Alabama State Department of Archives and History, Montgomery. Schedule IV for 1860 has been lost or destroyed.

Greene County in 1837, though still possessing large tracts of government land and a considerable squatter population, many of whom were large slaveholders, nevertheless had 53 per cent landowners. In 1844 landownership had increased to 60 per cent, in 1856 to 81 per cent, and by 1860 it had reached 82 per cent of the farm population.<sup>12</sup> In 1850 approximately 82 per cent of the farm population in Dallas County owned their land while in 1860, 84 per cent were landed proprietors.<sup>13</sup> Sixty-seven per cent of the agricultural population of Clarke County owned their farms in 1850 and 76 per cent in 1860. Monroe County had a 69 per cent ownership in 1850 but this had increased to 84 per cent by 1860. Perry County seems to have reached its maximum ownership of land in 1850, for in that year 84 per cent of the farm population were landowners while in 1860, 79 per cent fell in this category. The decrease in ownership was among the large slaveholders principally, for it will be seen presently that the percentage of landowners among the nonslaveholders steadily increased during this same period. Lowndes County experienced a similar shift in landownership. About 80 per cent owned their farms in 1850 while 77 per cent were landowners in 1860. In this county a slight decrease had taken place among all classes of landowners. Despite the slight decline in Perry and Lowndes counties, the ownership of land in the black belt as a whole increased from an average of 74 per cent in 1850 to 80 per cent in 1860.

Three counties lying in the piedmont above the black belt have been selected as typical of this hilly country. These counties are Coosa, lying just above the black belt near the center of the state, Randolph, on the eastern border, rugged and isolated, and Fayette on the western border, not unlike Randolph in its topography and soil. This large area typified by these counties has many fertile valleys and was generally productive

<sup>12</sup> In addition to the unpublished census reports for Greene County discussed in n. 11 above, the Greene County Tax Books, 1837, 1844, and 1856 were used. The Tax Books are located in the Greene County courthouse, Eutaw, Alabama.

<sup>13</sup> These figures were compiled from both the census returns (as in n. 11) and the Tax Books of Dallas County for 1850. The Tax Books, Real Estate and Personal Property, are located in the Alabama State Department of Archives and History.

in the period under discussion. Although the ground was uneven most of the soil was sandy loam and clay loam with a fine clay subsoil. The natural growth was oak, hickory, and pine, which is indicative of good soil. It will be recalled that much of this land had been in the hands of the Indians as late as 1836 and that the bulk of the Indian lands was still a part of the public domain as late as 1840. In 1850, 66 per cent of the agricultural population of Fayette County owned their farms but a decade later 82 per cent were landowners. Randolph County, completely across the state from Fayette as we have noted and a typically nonslaveholding region, had a 64 per cent landownership among its farmers in 1850 and 76 per cent ownership in 1860. Coosa County had a much larger slave population than Randolph or Fayette and represented a transitional belt between the plantation area and the up-country. It was not unlike such counties as Chambers, Talapoosa, and Tuscaloosa. In 1850, 75 per cent of the farmers of Coosa County owned their land but in 1860, 79 per cent were owners. The development in this piedmont region was strikingly similar to that of the black belt despite the continued existence of considerable tracts of public lands. Here ownership of land increased from 68 per cent in 1850 to 80 per cent in 1860, whereas in the black belt it had increased from 74 per cent to 80 per cent.

The pine land region of South Alabama presents an interesting situation. As late as 1855 this whole area was described as a forest one hundred miles square, most of which belonged to the Federal government. It was very sparsely settled and mostly by squatters, so it was said.<sup>14</sup> This was a section of the pine timber belt frequently called the "pine barrens" (originally meaning pine hills and not barren soil as has been so often thought) which extended almost continuously from the coast of Texas to New Jersey; and it has been invariably selected as the home of the "poor whites." The Alabama pine barrens is typical of the whole piney woods area in the Lower South and in the Carolinas.

<sup>14</sup> "A Planter," "On the Forests and Timber of South Alabama," in *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), XIX (1855), 611-13; cf. Lewis Troost, "Mobile and Ohio Railroad," *ibid.*, III (1847), 322.

The soil of this region in Alabama—as well as in the other states—varies greatly: a portion seems to be hardly more than sandbeds, penetrated quite frequently, however, with flat, shallow streams whose valleys are covered with alluvial deposits and are quite fertile; another portion has a sandy loam soil with clay subsoil and is fairly productive.<sup>15</sup>

Three counties have been selected from this piney woods area, Covington, Coffee, and Washington (though portions of Washington are prairie and river lands) for the purpose of analysis. The ownership of land in this area—despite the impression that most of it was government land and that most of the population were squatters—was considerably diffused by 1850 and was rapidly increasing. In 1850, 46 per cent of the farming population of Coffee County were landowners while the remaining 54 per cent were chiefly squatters. In 1860 landownership had increased to 75 per cent of the farming population. Landownership in Washington County increased from 54 per cent in 1850 to 74 per cent in 1860. In Covington, poorest of the lot, landownership increased from 40 per cent in 1850 to 68 per cent in 1860.

The spread of landownership was always greater among slaveholders than among nonslaveholders, but the gap between the two groups was rapidly narrowing during the last ten years of the ante-bellum period. Beginning with the pine belt we find that the ownership of land in Coffee County increased from 41 per cent in 1850 to 72 per cent in 1860 among the nonslaveholders; while that of the slaveholders increased from 68 per cent in 1850 to 91 per cent in 1860. This was a gain of 78 per cent for the nonslaveholders and about 32 per cent for the slaveholders in the last decade before the Civil War. The nonslaveholders in Covington County increased their ownership of land from 32 per cent in 1850 to 64 per cent in 1860—a gain of 100 per cent. The slaveholding farmers increased their ownership of land from 78 per cent in 1850 to 92 per cent in 1860, about 19 per cent. In Washington County the percentage of landowners among the nonslaveholders increased from 36 per cent in 1850 to 67 per cent in 1860. This was a gain of 86 per cent. The slaveowners increased their holdings from 75

<sup>15</sup> Saffold Berney, *Handbook of Alabama* (Birmingham, 1892), 443-47.

per cent in 1850 to 84 per cent in 1860 which was not quite 6.5 per cent. Summing up, it may be said that landownership among the non-slaveholders of the piney woods region as represented in these three sample counties increased about 87 per cent in the ten years before the war while that of the slaveholders increased 19 per cent.

The piedmont region where the nonslaveholders made up 68 per cent of the population in such counties as Coosa and 87 per cent in such counties as Randolph shows, like the pine barrens, a much greater increase in landownership for those who did not own slaves than for those who did during the decade 1850-1860. In 1850, 67 per cent of the nonslaveholding farmers and 92 per cent of the slaveholding farmers of Coosa were landowners; but in 1860 the ownership of land in these two groups had increased to 73 per cent and 94 per cent respectively. Randolph County, more rugged and having more public land and a larger squatter population than Coosa, had a lower percentage of landownership in the nonslaveholding group. In 1850, 60 per cent of the nonslaveholders and 96 per cent of the slaveholders had titles to their land. In 1860 landownership had increased to 73 per cent in the non-slaveholding class but had decreased to 93 per cent among the slaveholders. Fayette County experienced a parallel development. About 58 per cent of the nonslaveholders owned their farms in 1850 and 80 per cent in 1860. Nearly 94 per cent of the slaveholding group of farmers were landed proprietors in 1850 and 96 per cent in 1860. The spread of landownership of the nonslaveholding population had increased about 9 per cent in Coosa, 21 per cent in Randolph, and 38 per cent in Fayette. The increase in the slaveholding group had been about 2 per cent in Coosa and Fayette but in Randolph there had been a decrease of 3 per cent.

Such an increase in the distribution of landownership among the non-slaveholding population in the piedmont and piney woods regions where there were millions of acres of government lands<sup>16</sup> might have

<sup>16</sup> The widespread distribution of landownership in the Lower South and the rapid increase of ownership were partly due to the existence of great tracts of public lands. In 1853 the Commissioner of the General Land Office reported that there were still 79,255,556 acres of government land in the five states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana,

been anticipated. However, when both absolute and relative increase also takes place in the landownership of the nonslaveholder in the black belt it upsets the generalization that the rich were getting richer and the poor were getting poorer in the Cotton Kingdom. Sixty per cent of the nonslaveholders of Marengo County were landowners in 1850 and 80 per cent in 1860, an increase of 33 per cent. But the ownership of land among the slaveholding classes remained stationary at about 90 per cent during this time. In Greene County only 20 per cent of the nonslaveholders owned their farms in 1837, but in 1856, 75 per cent were landowners. This was an increase of 275 per cent in nineteen years. During this same time the ownership of land of the slaveholders increased from 68 per cent in 1837 to 86 per cent in 1856, a gain of 26 per cent in nineteen years.<sup>17</sup> The landownership of the nonslaveholders in Bibb County increased from 55 per cent of that class in 1850 to 60 per cent in 1860, an increase of 9 per cent. On the other hand, the percentage of slaveholders who held title to their land decreased from 95 per cent in 1850 to 92 per cent in 1860. Slightly over 47 per cent of the nonslaveholding farmers of Clarke County were landowners in 1850; but 67 per cent owned their land in 1860. This was a gain of 42 per cent. Of the slaveholders, 86 per cent were landed proprietors in 1850 and 91 per cent in 1860, a gain of not quite 6 per cent. Monroe County experienced a similar increase of landownership of both slaveholders and nonslaveholders in the period under discussion; but as in the other black belt counties already cited the greatest increase of ownership occurred among the nonslaveholders. Only 50 per cent of the nonslaveholders owned their land in 1850 but 75 per cent were owners in 1860, which represented a 50 per cent increase. Eighty-five per cent of the slaveholders owned their farms in 1850; but an additional 10 per cent became landowners during the following decade so that 94 per cent were proprietors in 1860. Perry County experienced some decline in the landownership of the slaveholders, but

and Mississippi. Of the 32,462,080 acres of land in Alabama, 15,049,693 acres at this date were Federal land. John Perkins, "The Public Lands and Land System of the United States," in *De Bow's Review*, XVII (1854), 140-71.

<sup>17</sup> See Greene County Tax Books, 1837, 1856, and n. 11 above, for the census material.

there was an increase of nonslaveholding landowners similar to that in Bibb County. As has been suggested, the nonslaveholding class was on the make even in this plantation county of black, rich prairie and clay loam lands. In 1850, 65 per cent of the nonslaveholding farmers in Perry County were landowners and in 1860, 69 per cent owned their farms, a rise of 6 per cent in ownership. Lowndes County experienced a slight decrease in the landownership of both slaveholders and non-slaveholders. The latter class declined from 63 per cent in 1850 to 58 per cent in 1860 while the former dropped from 90 per cent to 89 per cent in this period. Montgomery's slaveholding farmers and planters who owned land increased from 86 per cent in 1850 to 91 per cent in 1860; but the spread of landownership of the nonslaveholders decreased from 55 per cent to 50 per cent.

The pattern of increased distribution of landownership among the nonslaveholding classes was followed as we have noted in the pine barrens, the piedmont, and in all the counties of the black belt that were examined except Montgomery and Lowndes. The same trend of wider distribution of landownership was characteristic of the slaveholders—though to a less extent—in the piedmont and pine barrens. However, in several black belt counties the percentage of slaveholding landowners remained practically stationary and decreased slightly in Bibb, Perry, and Lowndes. It also decreased in Randolph in the piedmont.

The wide distribution of landownership is not sufficient in itself to measure potential well-being and security in an agricultural community. It must be determined whether landholdings are large enough and fertile enough to produce the basic necessities.

In analyzing the sizes of landholdings we will begin in the pine barrens and with the nonslaveholder. The structure of ownership among the nonslaveholding classes of the pine barrens was strikingly similar to that of the piedmont and of the black belt. The following tables<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> The date 1850 is used because Schedule IV that gives the sizes of holdings for 1860 is lost. See n. 11 above.

present a composite picture and a single county illustrative of the structure of landownership of the nonslaveholders:

Pine Barrens as a whole		Washington County	
<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of nonslaveholding landowners</i>	<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of nonslaveholding landowners</i>
To 50 . . . . .	26.09	To 50 . . . . .	29.63
51-100 . . . . .	26.34	51-100 . . . . .	16.67
101-200 . . . . .	24.92	101-200 . . . . .	22.22
201-300 . . . . .	3.41	201-300 . . . . .	1.85
301-400 . . . . .	3.78	301-400 . . . . .	5.56
401-500 . . . . .	2.05	401-500 . . . . .	3.70
501-1000 . . . . .	1.94	501-1000 . . . . .	0.00
not determined	11.47	1001-1500 . . . . .	1.85
		not determined	18.52

It will be observed that about 78 per cent of the nonslaveholding landowners possessed up to 200 acres of land. However, when landholdings of undetermined sizes are distributed in the several categories it seems probable that those who owned up to 200 acres would be something above 80 per cent in the pine barrens. Washington County follows this composite picture of the pine barrens fairly well if one takes into account the amount of landholdings of undetermined sizes.

An analysis of landownership of the nonslaveholder in the piedmont is given in the following tables:

Piedmont as a whole		Fayette County	
<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of nonslaveholding landowners</i>	<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of nonslaveholding landowners</i>
To 50 . . . . .	24.22	To 50 . . . . .	23.69
51-100 . . . . .	25.42	51-100 . . . . .	27.87
101-200 . . . . .	26.60	101-200 . . . . .	29.27
201-300 . . . . .	5.49	201-300 . . . . .	8.71
301-400 . . . . .	4.71	301-400 . . . . .	2.44
401-500 . . . . .	.82	401-500 . . . . .	.70
501-1000 . . . . .	.82	501-1000 . . . . .	.70
not determined	11.92	not determined	6.62

The classification of the nonslaveholders in the piedmont was very nearly the same as that in the pine barrens, that is, 76 per cent owned up to 200 acres and there was a fairly large percentage of holdings whose sizes were not determined by the census taker. The distribution of this undetermined group would probably bring the class of landowners who held up to 200 acres past 80 per cent of the total.

A division of the population in the black belt into slaveholders and

nonslaveholders reveals the fact that the latter class constituted 44 per cent of the agricultural population in 1850. An analysis of the sizes of the landholdings of this large minority group indicates a pattern of ownership strikingly similar to that of the pine barrens and piedmont where the nonslaveholders were in an overwhelming majority. The following is a composite table of the landownership of the nonslaveholder in 1850. Perry County follows this composite picture very closely and will serve as a specific illustration of the structure of ownership of the nonslaveholder in this area:

Black Belt as a whole		Perry County	
<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of nonslaveholding landowners</i>	<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of nonslaveholding landowners</i>
To 50 . . . . .	24.29	To 50 . . . . .	27.93
51-100 . . . . .	23.90	51-100 . . . . .	23.79
101-200 . . . . .	29.66	101-200 . . . . .	28.97
201-300 . . . . .	8.70	201-300 . . . . .	7.59
301-400 . . . . .	4.77	301-400 . . . . .	4.14
401-500 . . . . .	2.72	401-500 . . . . .	1.38
501-1000 . . . . .	3.15	501-1000 . . . . .	2.07
not determined	2.81	not determined	4.13

Just as in the pine barrens and the piedmont, practically 80 per cent of the nonslaveholding landowners of the black belt owned farms ranging up to 200 acres. In other words, something over three fourths of the nonslaveholding landowners of the three areas under examination owned up to 200 acres and a bit less than one fourth owned from 200 to 1,000 acres. A further analysis of the nonslaveholding farmers discloses the fact that roughly the three fourths who owned up to 200 acres cultivated about 50 acres of land or a three-horse farm. The fraction who owned above 200 acres cultivated from 50 to 200 acres of land, and usually employed hired labor which not infrequently embraced the slaves of some neighboring planter.

What of the sizes of the landholdings of the slaveowners? It is, perhaps, surprising to find that the majority of slaveowners even in the black belt of Alabama had farms that varied in size from a few to 500 acres, and that while the largest single group of nonslaveholders owned from 50 to 100 acres, the largest group of slaveholders owned from 100 to 200 acres of land. In other words, the majority of slaveholders even in the black belt were farmers rather than planters, who owned a few

slaves and worked in the field with them. The chief difference between the slaveholder and nonslaveholder of this farmer class was that a much larger percentage of slaveholders than nonslaveholders owned from 200 to 500 acres. An analysis of the sizes of the farms and percentages of owners in each category for the pine barrens, piedmont, and black belt is presented in the following tables:

## Pine Barrens as a whole

<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of slave- holding landowners</i>
To 50 .....	9.70
51-100 .....	14.94
101-200 .....	27.86
201-300 .....	11.47
301-400 .....	7.12
401-500 .....	3.34
501-1000 ....	15.27
1001-1500 ...	4.39
1501-2000 ...	.93
2000 up .....	1.96
not determined	3.37

## Coffee County

<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of slave- holding landowners</i>
To 50 .....	12.22
51-100 .....	14.44
101-200 .....	34.44
201-300 .....	14.44
301-400 .....	8.89
401-500 .....	4.44
501-1000 ....	7.78
1001-1500 ...	3.33

## Piedmont as a whole

<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of slave- holding landowners</i>
To 50 .....	3.63
51-100 .....	12.51
101-200 .....	27.37
201-300 .....	15.77
301-400 .....	15.77
401-500 .....	4.75
501-1000 ....	12.86
1001-1500 ...	1.32
1501-2000 ...	.79
2000 up .....	.71
not determined	4.52

## Coosa County

<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of slave- holding landowners</i>
To 50 .....	3.70
51-100 .....	8.80
101-200 .....	28.70
201-300 .....	9.72
301-400 .....	22.22
401-500 .....	3.94
501-1000 ....	13.19
1001-1500 ...	1.85
1501-2000 ...	1.39
2000 up .....	.93
not determined	5.56

## Black Belt as a whole

<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of slave- holding landowners</i>
To 50 .....	5.18
51-100 .....	8.11
101-200 .....	21.04
201-300 .....	12.19
301-400 .....	11.82
401-500 .....	6.22
501-1000 ....	20.29
1001-1500 ...	6.64
1501-2000 ...	2.52
2000 up .....	3.11
not determined	2.88

## Marengo County

<i>Acres Owned</i>	<i>Percentage of slave- holding landowners</i>
To 50 .....	5.53
51-100 .....	7.42
101-200 .....	17.22
201-300 .....	13.11
301-400 .....	10.74
401-500 .....	6.79
501-1000 ....	22.91
1001-1500 ...	8.58
1501-2000 ...	2.80
2000 up .....	4.90

At this point it may be observed that the pattern of slaveownership and of landownership in the piedmont and pine belt were almost identical. About 80 per cent of the slaveholding population owned 10 or less slaves, and approximately 80 per cent of this same group owned 500 or less acres of land. In other words, as has been said, the bulk of the slaveholding part of the farm population were farmers rather than planters. In the black belt, while the pattern of land and slaveownership were similar they were not identical. In this region the majority of slaveholders were farmers, but only a bare majority: about 51 per cent owned 10 or fewer slaves (which classed them as farmers) and 500 or less acres of land. In the piedmont and pine barrens about 20 per cent of the slaveowners were planters and only a few of these owned over 30 slaves; but in the black belt 49 per cent were planters who owned from 11 slaves to several hundred, and from 500 to several thousand acres of land. However, most of the planter class in the black belt were merely well-to-do, not rich; for they owned less than 30 slaves and less than 1,000 acres of land. The large planter class constituted scarcely more than 12 per cent of the slaveholders in this region, and as might be expected they ranged from moderately wealthy to immensely rich. However, the small planters and the slaveholding and nonslaveholding farmers owned the larger portion of the landed wealth—perhaps 75 per cent—in the black belt. In the other regions the nonslaveholders owned most of the property.

Thus far we have analyzed the spread of land among the farming population as a whole, which was found to be rapidly increasing during the last decade before the Civil War; next, landowners were divided into slaveholders and nonslaveholders and it was found that the ownership of land was widely diffused in both groups, but that the nonslaveholders were acquiring land more rapidly than the slaveholders. The third step was to analyze the sizes of farms and plantations of the slaveholders and nonslaveholders, from which analysis it was found that the great mass of slaveholders, like the nonslaveholders, were farmers and not planters. Finally, it was observed that the pattern of slave-

ownership and the pattern of landownership were virtually identical in the regions outside the plantation or black belt, and very similar in the black belt.

If, then, the majority of slaveholders were farmers and the majority of nonslaveholders were farmers who owned their lands, the stereotype of southern society of the late ante-bellum period, let us repeat, has no validity: society could not be divided into slaveholders and nonslaveholders, or, in other words, into "poor whites" and planters. If the several economic and social classes were graphically presented, the general appearance of the chart would be a gentle curve where small farmer, middle-sized farmer, large farmer, small planter, middle-sized planter, and large planter touched each other without any breaks.

By a certain arbitrariness, a very wealthy group at the top and a very poor group at the bottom of the economic structure may be segregated for examination. In the black belt the great planter class thus segregated was about 12 per cent of the slaveholding classes; but in the piedmont and pine barrens it hardly existed, for these regions could boast of only a small, moderately wealthy, planter class. As for determining the size of the "poor white" class certain elements have to be considered. The possession of a family-sized farm and sufficient livestock and tools to enable one to live comfortably would seem to eliminate 80 per cent of the white population of the piedmont and black belt and about 75 per cent in the piney woods from the "poor white" class in 1860. However, one fourth of the landless whites in the black belt were slaveholders, some of them large slaveholders. Many were obviously members of families with large landholdings, while others rented land. At any rate, such slaveholders could hardly be classed among the "poor whites" when they owned several thousand dollars worth of slaves, tools, and livestock, and often cultivated large farms or even plantations. The 15 per cent nonslaveholding group that had no land must be the source from which the "poor whites" can be isolated. On examination of the Agricultural Schedule for 1850, however, it is discovered that many of the farmers who did not own their land were renters who owned their tools, work stock, cows, swine, poultry, etc., and finally who, when

judged from their agricultural productions, were as good farmers as their landed neighbors. But, one is finally able to reach a class of individuals in the black belt who possessed little or no livestock or poultry. They were not listed on the Agricultural Schedule because they possessed less than \$100 worth of property and farm produce. This group made up hardly 5 per cent of the white population of the black belt.

In dealing with the piedmont and pine barrens it must be kept in mind that practically the entire population, despite their ownership of land, has been designated as "poor whites." No doubt the physical appearance of the great majority of these people was not pleasing to one from an urban civilization, or even to one from the black belt. There is no doubt that they "chawed" tobacco, that the women smoked their cob or clay pipes right along with the men and spat "ambeer" with the deadly accuracy of the long barrel squirrel rifle, into the fire, through the cracks between the logs, or into the eyes of an impertinent pig that insisted upon sticking his head into the door of the cabin. From an economic point of view, however, these people were not "poor whites." An examination of the Agricultural Schedule discloses the fact that the landowners and landless squatters were well supplied with the necessities of life. It discloses the fact that in both the pine barrens and the piedmont the raising of grain, fruits, and vegetables was far more important than the raising of cotton, and that finally, the chief business, the chief staple, was raising livestock.<sup>19</sup>

An examination of the agricultural and livestock productions of Covington County in 1850 shows that, of the 332 heads of families who owned no land, 227 owned from one to five horses; 100 from one to eight work oxen; 244 from a single milch cow to 200. Over 200 of these squatters—for that is what they were—owned in addition to the milch cows as high as 200 other cattle. The ownership of swine was even more widespread. Two hundred and ninety-one of the 332 squat-

<sup>19</sup> This section was always described as an excellent cattle range. In 1869 one writer gave a good account of this region: "In this section stock rearing is profitable, and is attended with little trouble; the piney woods bordering on the streams afford natural perennial pastures; and the climate being mild, housing the cattle is not required. The only expense incurred in this pursuit is to herd and export the cattle to market." Joseph Hodgson (ed.), *Alabama Manual and Statistical Register for 1869* (Montgomery, 1869).

ters in Covington possessed droves of swine ranging up to 200 head. The three most important food crops (garden, truck, and fruits were not usually reported) were corn, potatoes, and peas. One hundred and ninety of the squatters raised from 20 to 800 bushels of corn; about the same number raised from 10 to 500 bushels of sweet potatoes; and 102 raised from 1 to 90 bushels of peas. (Seventy-six of these squatters raised from 1 to 6 bales of cotton.)

An examination of the nonslaveholding and slaveholding landowners in the pine belt and piedmont reveals no great difference in either livestock or agricultural productions. In the case of the landowner the value of the livestock in the pine barrens, and quite frequently in the piedmont, was greater than the land. The explanation of the existence of this grazing industry is that there were millions of acres of government lands, much of it open pine woods without undergrowth, covered almost the year around with wild peas, vetch, and a coarse grass, either wire grass or broomsedge. This open forest was free alike to all, which explains why the squatter was usually as well off as the landowner. Cattle and swine were shipped or driven to Montgomery, Mobile, or Pensacola, or driven back into the black belt and sold to the planters who, despite their effort at self-sufficiency, usually found themselves short of provisions.

While the slaveholding farmer and small planter dwelt on their land and usually worked with their slaves or sent their sons into the field, the rich slaveholding planter in Alabama (and the Lower South generally) more and more tended toward village or town life. The mansions of ante-bellum times were usually located in town or village at no great distance from the plantation. Today, if one wishes to see how the homes of the large planter of Alabama looked, he should get off the main thoroughfares and go to Eutaw, Greensboro, Lowndesboro, Selma, Huntsville, Demopolis, Marion, and Montgomery.<sup>20</sup>

Finally, it can be said in conclusion that while the great planter most frequently lived in village or town, and the farmers and small planters

<sup>20</sup> Location of residence can be determined from Schedule I of the census and from the Tax Books.

in the country, there was very little segregation of landholdings: the census returns and the tax lists show an intermingling of all economic classes. The hundred-acre farm would be sandwiched between two-thousand-acre plantations. Furthermore, there was no marked difference in the quality of the land held by the slaveholder and nonslaveholder in the black belt. When there was a difference in the land values, it could usually be attributed to the improvements, such as ditching, fencing, and the construction of more expensive buildings by slave labor. In the piedmont and pine barrens the slaveholder would usually be settled on the bottom lands of the streams in small black belts; but here as in the black belt proper, nonslaveholders would be interspersed between planters.

There are a great many other matters such as education, religion, and political domination by the planter class that cannot be considered here because of lack of space. But, it is hoped that these matters may receive consideration at a future date. It can be stated, however, that planter monopoly in these realms as well as in the economic has been seriously overestimated.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> The statistical analyses presented confirm the classification in Daniel R. Hundley, *Social Relations in Our Southern States* (New York, 1860). Hundley wrote of the Old South and published his book before the Civil War. Mr. A. N. J. Den Hollander, in his "The Tradition of 'Poor Whites,'" in W. T. Couch (ed.), *Culture in the South* (Chapel Hill, 1934), comes to many of the same conclusions reached by Hundley and by the writers of this essay.

# Northern Congressional Democrats as Defenders of the South During Reconstruction

BY ALBERT V. HOUSE, JR.

On April 14, 1871, Senator Carl Schurz of Missouri went out of his way to admonish the northern Democrats "who directly or indirectly by agitation threaten the overthrow of the settlement embodied in the constitutional amendments."<sup>1</sup> This senatorial neophyte who was soon to discover the ugly realities of Reconstruction as administered by Grant appointees, had prefaced his advice to the opposition with the statement that "a majority of the Republican party in the North are strongly in favor of a liberal and conciliatory policy, and . . . would long ago have forced their representatives . . . to adopt such a policy had they not been continually hampered and disturbed by the misdeeds of the disorderly element of the South."<sup>2</sup> By contrast, Moorfield Storey, although handicapped by a Boston reform background and a position as secretary for Senator Charles Sumner's Foreign Relations Committee, was able to explain the wayward wanderings of the Democrats with the keen observation that "Their only right to exist is their opposition to our principles; if they adopt them, they commit political suicide, they cease to *be* Democrats, whatever name they may choose to adopt."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at a meeting of the Southern Historical Association held at New Orleans, Louisiana, on November 3, 1938. The writer is greatly indebted to three of his former students, Mr. John D. Koontz, Mrs. Eileen H. Koontz, and Mrs. Jean Wise Harris of Washington, D. C., for their valuable assistance in the research connected with this paper.

<sup>2</sup> *Congressional Globe*, 42 Cong., 1 Sess., 690 (April 14, 1871).

<sup>3</sup> Moorfield Storey to his father, Washington, June 1, 1868, in M. A. DeWolfe Howe, *Portrait of An Independent, Moorfield Storey* (Boston, 1932), 119.

These divergent views of Schurz and Storey, who were both on the threshold of long careers as persistent, clear-sighted independents, serve to introduce the whole problem of evaluating the course of northern congressional Democratic leaders during Reconstruction and for half a decade thereafter. Undoubtedly contemporary Republican orators and press dispatches agreed with Schurz in charging northern Democrats with semitreasonable defense of the South. Likewise, general histories, textbooks, and even scholarly monographs usually accept this picture of futile, misdirected, Democratic valor as self-evident truth. Memoirs, sketches, and biographies of Democratic leaders, although limited in number and quality, proudly portray their heroes' explosive protests against the "unconstitutional" travesty of justice which was foisted on the South. However, the literature of Reconstruction days has been content with a cursory analysis of the activities of the leading legislative representatives of the northern Democracy who stood in positions of power. Splendid monographs have revealed the sordid results of the Radical program in the South; southern leaders whose span of service to their section extended beyond the days of the Confederacy have been studied; northern Republicans responsible for the "settlement between the sections" have also been the subject of biographers; but of the northern leaders of the minority party the careers of presidential candidates only have been carefully examined.<sup>4</sup> In effect, students of the period have failed to follow Moorfield Storey in his tentative attempt

<sup>4</sup> The only thoroughly satisfactory account of the career of one of these leaders is Allan Nevins, *Abram S. Hewitt: With Some Account of Peter Cooper* (New York, 1935). yet Hewitt did not come upon the national stage until 1875. Biographies of three of them are now in manuscript form: Charles C. Tansill, "Thomas F. Bayard"; Don Seitz, "Fernando Wood, Democrat"; and Albert V. House, Jr., "Samuel J. Randall, Pennsylvania Politician." The first of these will appear at an early date and undoubtedly will be very valuable. In addition, many of the remaining figures have been eulogized and embalmed in studies of the "Life and Public Services of" variety, such as William U. Hensel, *Life and Public Services of Grover Cleveland and Allen G. Thurman* (Philadelphia, 1888); William Van Zandt Cox and Milton H. Northrup, *Life of Samuel Sullivan Cox* (Syracuse, 1899); Edward Spencer, *An Outline of the Public Life and Services of Thomas F. Bayard* (New York, 1880); John W. Holcombe and Hubert M. Skinner, *Life and Public Services of Thomas A. Hendricks* (Indianapolis, 1886). Two shorter works are Franklin D. Scott, "The Political Career of Wm. R. Morrison," in Illinois State Historical Society, *Transactions* (Springfield, 1900-), XXXIII (1926), 134-71; and Mrs. Hope Graham, "Hendricks in Reconstruction" (M. A. thesis, Indiana University,

to analyze the realities of the position and activities of northern Democratic leaders.

Now, fourscore years after the "dismal decade," many additional questions surrounding seeming Democratic defense of the South may be asked. What forces motivated such men? Were they merely concerned with rebuilding their party on a national basis? Were they, as representatives of a fading commercial and agricultural conservatism, trying to prevent the amazing march of the newer industrial kings who were hiding behind the skirts of "Republican patriots"? Were they merely trying to build a reputation and record of concern with the fate of the South which might be turned to their personal political advantage when southern conservatives returned to the halls of Congress looking for a northern Democratic leader with an established following? Although the record of accomplishment is considerable, is it all that it should be? Did these northern Democrats lose many a struggle because of faulty parliamentary tactics or unwillingness to effect reasonable compromises with the "half-breed" elements in the Republican party who wished to restrain the wild excesses of the Radicals? Did they at any time consciously or unconsciously "sell out" the South because of the political and economic necessities of their own constituencies? Finally, does this record of friendship for the South extend to the economic as well as to the political sphere?

From 1865 until the opening session of the Forty-third Congress in 1873, the Democrats constituted a hopeless, demoralized, suspected minority, their band numbering as few as thirty in the House and less than a baker's dozen in the Senate. The Forty-third Congress found their ranks increased by the return of a few conservative representatives from those southern states which had restored white rule, as well as by a few Liberal Republicans. This added strength, together with the

1912). No sketches of Speaker Michael Kerr of Indiana or Congressman Charles A. Eldredge of Wisconsin appear in the *Dictionary of American Biography*.

Two biographies of Democratic presidential candidates have appeared since this study was completed: Stewart Mitchell, *Horatio Seymour of New York* (Cambridge, Mass., 1938); Alexander C. Flick and G. S. Lobrano, *Samuel Jones Tilden, A Study in Political Sagacity* (New York, 1939).

lack of Republican party discipline during Grant's second term, with such leaders as James A. Garfield and James G. Blaine occasionally lending their silent aid to the Democrats, provided the minority party with considerable power, especially in filibustering against objectionable legislation.<sup>5</sup> From December, 1875, to March, 1881, they controlled the House yet never quite reached the magical two-thirds majority necessary for amnesty legislation, for overriding of presidential vetoes,<sup>6</sup> or for the suspension of the rules to secure prompt and positive action on vital legislative proposals which otherwise would lie buried in an overburdened calendar. This fact spelled defeat for the Democrats in their battle with Hayes over legislative riders to appropriation bills, especially after Garfield as House minority leader in the Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Congresses turned about face and whipped his supporters into strict party support of the President.<sup>7</sup> In the Senate the Democrats were forced to wait until the sessions of the Forty-sixth Congress in 1879 to secure even a bare majority. Yet, in the preceding Congress they received scattering support from the followers of Senator Roscoe Conkling, who were not averse to embarrassing a President whose cabinet and patronage policies disregarded their prerogatives.

Any list of Democratic leaders of the period can only be a selective sampling. Obviously the Democratic speakers of the House, the floor-leaders of the party in each body, and the chairmen of important committees must be included. Likewise, it is expedient to study their lieutenants who co-operated in staging filibusters, and those individuals whose speeches clarified the realities of the issues involved and helped to hasten the return to sanity of large numbers of thoughtful citizens. Using these standards the delegation of House leaders would include

<sup>5</sup> George F. Hoar, *Autobiography of Seventy Years*, 2 vols. (New York, 1903), I, 203; also quoted in Theodore C. Smith, *The Life and Letters of James Abram Garfield*, 2 vols. (New Haven, 1925), I, 448.

<sup>6</sup> True, a Republican Senate stood guard to support Republican presidential vetoes, yet sufficient hostility to Grant and Hayes existed in the Senate to encourage the Democrats in some of their attempts. In addition, the Democrats were concerned with "keeping the record straight."

<sup>7</sup> Smith, *James Abram Garfield*, II, 679-87; Charles R. Williams (ed.), *Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes*, 5 vols. (Columbus, 1922-1926), III, 529-47.

Speaker Samuel J. Randall of Pennsylvania, Samuel S. Cox, Fernando Wood, and Abram S. Hewitt of New York, William S. Holman, Daniel W. Voorhees, William E. Niblack, and Speaker Michael Kerr of Indiana, Charles A. Eldredge of Wisconsin, and William R. Morrison of Illinois. In the Senate Thomas A. Hendricks of Indiana, Allen G. Thurman of Ohio, and Thomas F. Bayard of Delaware would qualify. By virtue of their positions of power and outstanding contributions, Speakers Kerr and Randall, Congressman Cox, and Senators Thurman and Bayard will be used most frequently to illustrate Democratic activities.

Recalling the weakness of the Democratic party in Congress in the decade after Appomattox, and considering the revolutionary powers successfully seized by the Radicals backed by a large majority of patriotic quasi fanatics whose potent imaginations and glib tongues had frightened the southern Negro, the northern mechanic, and the western plainsman into believing that Democratic victory at the polls would really represent a rebel triumph on the battlefield, we may well ask what could be fairly expected of the Democratic leadership in Congress over this stretch of endless years of military fright masquerading as "constitutional" government. The confusing record of accomplishment and theoretical possibilities can best be discussed under the following four headings: talk and agitation, negative action, compromises effected, and positive action.

Within the first division of *talk and agitation* will fall all speeches and interviews protesting against each of the political and military Reconstruction acts, as well as the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth amendments to the Constitution, especially the peculiar ratification technique used to force the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment.<sup>8</sup> The contemporary Democratic press reprinted many of the excellent speeches which came from the mouths of their legislative leaders. The national platform of the party in 1868 as well as that of the Liberal Republicans

<sup>8</sup> The southern states while technically out of the Union were, in effect, required to ratify this amendment as a condition of readmittance.

in 1872 incorporated most of the major points of these oratorical efforts, and such recent writers as Claude G. Bowers<sup>9</sup> and George F. Milton<sup>10</sup> have included dramatic excerpts from these passionate outbursts. Professor Randall's excellent general summary of historical thought on the period, however, is noticeably lacking in concrete examples of Democratic thinking.<sup>11</sup> Although handicapped with a record tinged with "Copperheadism," Senator Hendricks challenged nearly every piece of Radical legislation which passed before him. His speeches opposing the Thirteenth Amendment,<sup>12</sup> the Freedmen's Bureau bill,<sup>13</sup> the Fourteenth Amendment,<sup>14</sup> the Military Reconstruction Act of March, 1867,<sup>15</sup> and his review on January 30, 1868, of the entire course of congressional Reconstruction,<sup>16</sup> although revealing a harsh pugnacity and an unbending refusal to recognize the "Radical settlement," did expose the injustice and ultimate effect of the program as manipulated by Thaddeus Stevens' "French Directory" Joint Committee on Reconstruction. He refused to "'amend the constitution amid hate and passion' . . . but only when 'the public should be in a cool deliberative frame of mind.'" <sup>17</sup> On February 16, 1866, while criticizing the Redistribution bill, he dramatized the economic purposes of the legislation by charging that the aim of the bill was the cutting of the representation of the agricultural portion of the country and to that extent the increasing of the representation of the manufacturing districts.<sup>18</sup>

In the House Randall's speech of February 5, 1866,<sup>19</sup> analyzing the

<sup>9</sup> Claude G. Bowers, *The Tragic Era; the Revolution after Lincoln* (Cambridge, 1929), 104, 108, 342.

<sup>10</sup> George F. Milton, *The Age of Hate, Andrew Johnson and the Radicals* (New York, 1930), 302-303, 388.

<sup>11</sup> James G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York, 1937).

<sup>12</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 1456-58 (April 7, 1864).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., 314-19 (January 19, 1866), 368-72 (January 23, 1866).

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 876-85 (February 16, 1866).

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 1385-90 (February 15, 1867), 1460-62 (February 16, 1867), 1638-40 (February 20, 1867), 1973 (March 2, 1867).

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 853-59 (January 30, 1868).

<sup>17</sup> Quoted by James A. Woodburn, in *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), VIII, 534.

<sup>18</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., 878 (February 16, 1866).

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 662-65 (February 5, 1866).

existing status of the South, is a fine example of the thinking of a Democratic leader. He insisted that the South had never been out of the Union, that a state could not commit treason, and that the Constitution established a perpetual union according to contemporary decisions of the Supreme Court. He defended the President by citing Lincoln's 10 per cent plan as a precedent for Johnson's actions and taunted the Radicals for denying the secession of Tennessee by nominating Johnson for vice-president in 1864. He challenged congressional assumption of the power of pardon and insisted that the retention of rights and privileges by the loyal inhabitants of the "rebel" states had previously gone unquestioned. While agreeing to the necessity of Federal taxation of the South so as to pay the national debt and lessen the tax burden of the North, he reminded the Radicals that taxation of the South under existing circumstances was taxation without representation. Many other citations could be given to Randall's speeches opposing the granting of suffrage to Negroes in the District of Columbia,<sup>20</sup> protesting the Fourteenth Amendment,<sup>21</sup> presenting additional defenses of President Johnson,<sup>22</sup> in all of which he mercilessly paraded the inconsistencies, the partisan ruthlessness, and the definite unconstitutional character of Radical legislative schemes.

In 1869 the inauguration of President Grant and the readmission of most of the southern states seemed to promise an era of peace and constructive rebuilding of the South. Yet, the hopes of peaceable men everywhere were soon blasted by the activities of the Klan, by the corrupt inefficiency of Grant's appointees in the South, and by the plundering of the credit and treasuries of the southern states on the authority of black legislatures. This breakdown brought with it a renewed program of Federal interference with the most sacred attributes of state sovereignty such as the police powers. Grant blindly supported his agents in the South and likewise followed the most extreme suggestions of the Radicals on Capitol Hill. Although Senator Hendricks was

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 260 (January 16, 1866).

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 1057 (February 27, 1866), 2530-31 (May 10, 1866).

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 2406-2408 (May 5, 1866); 2 Sess., 204-205 (December 19, 1866); 40 Cong., 1 Sess., 744 (July 19, 1867); 2 Sess., 1546-47 (February 29, 1868).

no longer in his seat to strike body blows at this return to the rule of force, Thurman and Bayard, although serving as freshmen members, took up the torch of political and economic conservatism, state rights, and simple, fundamental justice. Henry Watterson later described Thurman as "the last surviving typical representative of the simple planter's republic, with its gentlemenhood and integrity, its wide verandas and easy jog-trotting ways, its plenty and its pride."<sup>23</sup> Bayard's outspoken defense of the political life of the South was so pointed and continuous that one of his correspondents whimsically catalogued him as an "ex-Confederate."<sup>24</sup> In the struggles which soon appeared over the passage of the three Force Acts, the disciplining of the Georgia legislature, the readmission of Mississippi, and the perennial problem of providing Louisiana with a "Republican republican form of government," these oratorical giants used their incisive intellects to great advantage.<sup>25</sup> Both men were unfortunately too prone to rely on legal reasoning to buttress their positions, yet occasionally each actually boiled over in wrath at the vicious practices used by Radical agents. Bayard served as the sole minority member on the Senate committee to investigate alleged outrages in the South in 1870-1871. His masterly minority report<sup>26</sup> and lengthy speech in support of it stressed the fact that although the committee had been granted authority to investigate eleven

<sup>23</sup> Louisville *Courier Journal*, July 22, 1878.

<sup>24</sup> D. Stewart Hessey to Thomas F. Bayard, Cambridge, Maryland, September 30, 1872, in Thomas F. Bayard Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress). The Bayard Papers are fragmentary before 1880, dealing primarily with local politics in Delaware.

<sup>25</sup> Interested students should examine the speeches of Bayard and Thurman on these questions as recorded in the *Congressional Globe* and *Congressional Record*. a. "First Force Bill" (Bayard), *Cong. Globe*, 41 Cong., 2 Sess., 3803-3806 (May 25, 1870), (Thurman), 3560 ff. (May 18, 1870), 3660-62 (May 20, 1870). b. "Second Force Bill" (Bayard), *ibid.*, 3 Sess., 575 (January 18, 1871), 1654 (February 24, 1871); 42 Cong., 1 Sess., App., 15-26 (March 20, 1871), 239-47 (April 12, 1871); (Thurman), 41 Cong., 2 Sess., 577-78 (January 18, 1871); 42 Cong., 1 Sess., App., 216-24 (April 13, 1871). c. "Third Force Bill" (Bayard), *ibid.*, 2 Sess., App., 452-69 (May 21, 1872), (Thurman), 665-71 (May 21, 1872). d. "Disciplining the Legislature of Georgia" (Bayard), *ibid.*, 41 Cong., 2 Sess., 170-72 (December 16, 1869), (Thurman), 210-12, 225-27. e. "Readmission of Mississippi" (Bayard), *ibid.*, 1281-83 (February 15, 1870), (Thurman), 1183-84 (February 10, 1870), 1218-19 (February 11, 1870). f. "Louisiana," see n. 28 *pass.*

<sup>26</sup> For "Views of the Minority," see *United States Senate Reports*, 42 Cong., 1 Sess. (Serial No. 1468), No. 1. Pt. II, 1-48.

states, it had confined its inquiries to North Carolina alone and on the basis of the resulting newspaper clippings, rumors, and testimony of Radical witnesses had drafted a law (the Ku Klux Klan bill) to indict and "protect" the entire South.<sup>27</sup> The assault of both Bayard and Thurman on the Radical regime in Louisiana was particularly devastating. They kept up their oratorical gunfire for half a decade, never failing to taunt the Radicals for their continued recourse to force while enjoying complete control of all civil officials in the region for a decade. What a confession of the weakness and bankruptcy of the whole policy!<sup>28</sup>

*Negative action*, the second topical basis for analysis of Democratic activity in minority days, may be freely translated to mean parliamentary filibusters designed to stall the plans of the majority. The chronicle of postponements and delays accumulated by the Democrats show increasing effectiveness during the decade after the war, culminating in a series of brilliant filibusters in January and February, 1875, which extracted the teeth from the Sumner Civil Rights bill and prevented the passage of General John Coburn's Force bill. This training in obstruction was a serious handicap in later days when the party found itself in control of either branch of Congress, since its leaders had emerged on the basis of "do-nothing" politics. While some filibusters were conducted primarily to secure the right to debate bills before passage, such as Randall's sixteen-hour effort on the Test Oath for Attorneys bill on January 22, 1867,<sup>29</sup> the usual purpose was postponement or thwarting of legislative proposals. The Democratic senatorial leadership used this weapon primarily to force the Radicals to go on record as opposed to a variety of moderate policies which the liberal press was spreading over the country. This situation is illustrated by the amendments to the Klan bill offered by Senators Eugene Casserly of

<sup>27</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 42 Cong., 1 Sess., 173-75 (March 20, 1871).

<sup>28</sup> For Bayard on Louisiana, see *ibid.*, 2 Sess., 3175-76 (May 8, 1872); 3 Sess. App., 184-85 (February 27, 1873); *Cong. Record*, 43 Cong., 1 Sess., 3189 ff. (April 20, 1874); 2 Sess., 329-35 (January 8, 1875). For Thurman's review of the Louisiana situation, see *ibid.*, 771-84 (January 27, 1875).

<sup>29</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 39 Cong., 2 Sess., 646-73 (January 22, 1867).

California, Bayard, Thurman, and others on February 24, 1871.<sup>30</sup> The five day and night filibuster directed by Thurman against the "disciplining" of the Georgia legislature is another example of an attempt to make the issues clear to the country.<sup>31</sup>

Although Senate rules of unlimited debate would seem to suggest that body as the logical place for tactics of obstruction, the House actually provides examples of more effective stalling. In February, 1867, Randall prevented a final vote on Stevens' Military Reconstruction bill for two weeks, nearly long enough to kill it for that session.<sup>32</sup> Similar parliamentary techniques used by Randall, Holman, Eldredge, James Brooks of New York, and Albert G. Burr of Illinois briefly held up consideration of the impeachment resolutions against President Johnson.<sup>33</sup> Again, Randall succeeded in securing a temporary advantage through adjournment when drastic amendments to the Second Force Act were about to be considered on February 1, 1871.<sup>34</sup> In January and February, 1875, Randall conducted a spectacular and successful filibuster against General Coburn's new Force bill and the remnants of Sumner's Civil Rights bill which had been kicked around Capitol Hill for three or more years. The reappearance of Civil Rights and Force bills in 1875 was the result of a train of events dating back to 1872. On May 13 of that year General Benjamin F. Butler reported a bill removing political disabilities from all but some seven hundred and fifty of the more responsible and active officials of the Confederacy.<sup>35</sup> Supposedly by general understanding this bill restoring political rights to the white man was to be linked with a Civil Rights bill, framed by Sumner, which would guarantee personal rights to the southern black man. Previously the Democrats had thrice refused to accept any such bargain. The Civil Rights bill needed only a bare majority vote while

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 41 Cong., 3 Sess., 1633-54 (February 24, 1871).

<sup>31</sup> Hensel, *Cleveland and Thurman*, 348-50. See also, William B. Hesseltine, *Ulysses S. Grant* (New York, 1935), 157-58, 188.

<sup>32</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 39 Cong., 2 Sess., 1036-37 (February 6, 1867), 1315-21 (February 18, 1867), 1356-58 (February 19, 1867).

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 1396-1402 (February 24, 1868), 1425-26 (February 25, 1868).

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 41 Cong., 3 Sess., 893 (February 1, 1871).

<sup>35</sup> Hesseltine, *Ulysses S. Grant*, 357.

the Amnesty bill required the approval of two thirds of each house; hence a trade was necessary to put both measures through as many Republicans thought Sumner's bill extreme. While its sponsor was absent, the school and jury service clauses were taken out of the bill, but in spite of his opposition the Amnesty bill passed the Senate while the Civil Rights bill languished.<sup>86</sup>

The next three years saw a growth in sentiment for amnesty and of Democratic power both in the nation and in the South, as state after state came under the control of the conservative white elements. Senator Sumner's political prestige was distinctly in eclipse but he continued his fight for his pet measure and even added cemeteries to the field of equal treatment. Meanwhile the alarming exodus of southern states imperiled the chances of Republican success in the approaching presidential contest of 1876. Some rumors of bloodshed in Alabama and the Brooks-Baxter war in Arkansas offered the few remaining extreme Radicals a chance to return some areas of the South to military government and thus guarantee victory in 1876. The death of Sumner on March 11, 1874, far from killing his bill, gave it a sentimental backing which many members of his party respected. This proposed return to the harsh methods of four years before was distasteful to many moderate Republicans such as Blaine, Garfield, and Eugene Hale of Maine.<sup>87</sup> Incidentally there was little love lost between these Republican leaders and Butler and Coburn, the managers of the bills. All eventualities were supposedly taken care of before January 27, 1875, when Butler tried to force the Civil Rights bill through the House. The Democrats, however, soon rallied to the leadership of Randall and kept Butler from reaching the speaker's table where the bill rested. During the first encounter which lasted forty-six and one-half hours, the roll was called seventy-five times. New rules were reported but enough Republicans sided with the Democrats in both Houses to strike out the more objectionable sections on schools and cemeteries.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>86</sup> See James G. Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress*, 2 vols. (Norwich, Conn., 1884-1886), II, 511-15, for a brief description of these proceedings.

<sup>87</sup> Smith, *James Abram Garfield*, I, 523.

<sup>88</sup> *New York Times*, January 24, 27, 28, 30, 31, February 3, 6, 1875.

Three weeks later the members of the minority were again fighting with their backs to the wall to prevent the passage of Coburn's Force bill, which had been based on an investigation in Alabama and adopted by the Republican caucus over the strenuous objections of Blaine and others. Its provisions authorized the President to suspend the writ of habeas corpus in any state or part of a state when, in his judgment, the public safety demanded such suspension. The operation of the bill was absolutely unlimited as to time or territory. If it were passed by the existing Congress, it could not be repealed by the next without the consent of the Republican President and Senate.<sup>39</sup> Such a bill, when administered by Republicans, might paralyze the reviving remnants of the Democratic party in the South. The bill was sprung on the House in violation of an understanding to continue consideration of the Sundry Civil Appropriation bill. Since the motion to suspend the rules would be in order any time after the opening of the next legislative day on February 25, Butler may have been gambling on catching Randall and his "phalanx" unprepared. He soon found out that, instead, he himself was unprepared, because the Democrats discovered that Butler did not have enough Republican members on hand to constitute a quorum. This all happened during an evening session; thus Butler could not simply call in missing members from the cloakrooms, but had to sit throughout the night and well into the next afternoon, waiting for the absentees. During this long night Speaker Blaine refused to count the silent Democrats as present.<sup>40</sup> When the House assembled on Friday, February 26, the Democrats insisted on reading the journal of the filibustering session. Threatened with boredom the Republicans offered a compromise which, although it allowed the bill to pass the House, would occur too late for the Senate to take action.<sup>41</sup>

Students of Pennsylvania history will notice that this extended demonstration of parliamentary leadership by Randall paralleled a series of investigations, which Randall was supervising, into the activities of a ring of Treasury thieves in the Keystone state. Many of the

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, February 25, 26, 1875.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, February 26, 1875.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*; *Cong. Record*, 43 Cong., 2 Sess., 1799 (February 26, 1875).

figures involved in these scandals were the bosses of the Pennsylvania Democracy. The seeming coincidence suggests that Randall was consciously building a reputation at home and in the South which would guarantee his selection as speaker when the Democratic majority, elected in November, 1874, should meet to choose its leader in December, 1875.

In the main the Democratic activities so far described, regardless of their political purposes, lightened the burden of the South to some extent. However, in spite of continued exposure of Republican horrors in southern states, concern over the treatment which the South was receiving was *not* the issue which finally united the Democrats of the North. Likewise, continued seizure of power by the central government did not disturb the voters of the North. The breath-taking expansion of industrial efficiency, the rapid settlement of the West, the appearance of transcontinental railroads, and the general smugness which usually accompanies the accumulation of wealth had lulled the northern electorate to sleep. The depression which set in after 1873 gave the Democrats their opportunity. They came up with the watchword of "economy and retrenchment" as the cry which was to rally their own disordered ranks as well as attract all who were repelled by the various policies of government and misgovernment which have been labeled "Grantism." It is significant that in this Democratic surge to power which appeared in 1874, the South and all its affairs were considered only in passing. The real issues were the depression, unemployment, Republican corruption, reckless granting of the nation's resources to corporations, the excessively high level of government expenditures, and the too rapid payment of the national debt with the resulting contraction of the currency and the imminence of resumption of specie payment.

In the formulation and presentation of these issues all Democratic leaders participated, yet the "economy and retrenchment" which served as the foundation stone of the structure comes near being the sole property of Congressmen Holman and Randall. A continuous parade of public figures have been designated as the "Watchdogs of the

Treasury' by worshipping biographers. Yet, the record of the years 1869-1875 reveals the howls of Randall and Holman as they sat across the threshold of the Treasury growling at Republican members who sought to dip their fingers into the nation's funds.<sup>42</sup> Although Garfield fought valiantly to control the appetites of his colleagues,<sup>43</sup> Randall and Holman continued to bark out assurances of their ability to cut appropriations \$50,000,000 in a budget of about \$300,000,000, only four fifths of which was for current expenses.

Democratic accomplishments on economic legislation affecting the South can also be placed in the category of *negative action*, largely because of its "do-nothing" character. To put it bluntly, northern Democrats sat silently while various forms of economic exploitation were practiced on the South. They either failed to sense the ultimate economic effect of such legislation as extreme protective tariffs or else had their hands tied by the demands of their own constituencies. In the tariff debates of 1867, 1869, 1870, 1872, and 1875 most of the Democrats from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York either presented weak protests, then silently voted for protection or, as in the case of Randall on March 13, 1871, took the lead in doing away with the taxes on tea and coffee, thus cutting government income tremendously and necessitating the continuance of high protective rates as revenue producers.<sup>44</sup> The record of the Democrats in the Senate was no better, as Senator John Sherman of Ohio pointed out on March 27, 1872. He taunted the Democrats with the fact that on the day when the Senate voted on Randall's proposition, only three Democrats had voted to

<sup>42</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 40 Cong., 3 Sess., 425, 432 (January 18, 1869); 41 Cong., 2 Sess., 984 (February 2, 1870), 2727-28 (April 15, 1870); 42 Cong., 3 Sess., 1126-30 (February 5, 1873), 1982-89 (March 1, 1873); *Cong. Record*, 43 Cong., 1 Sess., 2282-97 (March 19, 1874), 3095 ff. (April 15-24, 1874), 4092 ff. (May 20, 21, 1874); 2 Sess., 85 ff. (December 15-18, 1874).

<sup>43</sup> Smith, *James Abram Garfield*, I, 478-527.

<sup>44</sup> Allan Nevins, *Grover Cleveland* (New York, 1932), 284. Protective tariffs if too high will undoubtedly be poor revenue producers. The country, however, was expanding at such a phenomenal rate in the 1870's that in spite of depression after 1873 the income from customs held up surprisingly well. Figures for the fiscal years ending in June of 1872, 1873, and 1874, as quoted by Samuel S. Cox in debate in 1875, do show an annual decrease of more than \$20,000,000 for each of these years, but even in 1874 the total was \$163,000,000. See *Cong. Record*, 43 Cong., 2 Sess., 1390-95 (February 17, 1875).

retain the tax on tea and coffee, five had voted to place it on the free list, and seven had been absent. He made their inconsistency still more apparent with the statement that "some gentlemen here voted to put tea and coffee on the free list so that the other duties on protected articles should not be disturbed. It is also true that certain gentlemen who have been devoting themselves to a revenue tariff, and proclaiming their desire to pull down the duties on the protected articles, have voted for the very measure that prevents it. How they can reconcile that with their theory I do not know."<sup>45</sup> Bayard, who had been absent when the vote was taken, attempted to reply at the time and also a month later but succeeded only in still further dramatizing the perfidy and subterfuge of his fellow party members.<sup>46</sup> Samuel S. Cox, formerly of Ohio but then representing a New York City district, is an outstanding exception to this Democratic record of apathy on the tariff. On March 28, 1870, May 3, 1872, and February 17, 1875, he made three resounding speeches against the principles of the protective tariff as unfair taxes on the laboring men to enrich a small group of two hundred capitalists.<sup>47</sup>

In somewhat the same manner these leaders were contented with silence or at least feeble dissent when public lands were granted to corporations for railroads in the West while the South was forced to rebuild its stricken system by private and state credit. True, the supply of public lands in the South was not sufficient to enable the matching of the grants to western roads, but the least that might have been done was a thorough exposure of the financial methods used by Carpetbag legislatures and railroad entrepreneurs in the rebuilding and expansion of the network of southern lines.<sup>48</sup> Disclosure would have made difficult the floating of railroad bonds and the bonds of those southern states from whose treasuries the roads were fraudulently financed.

<sup>45</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 42 Cong., 2 Sess., 2005 (March 27, 1872).

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 2923-24 (April 30, 1872).

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 41 Cong., 2 Sess., 2239-51 (March 28, 1870); 42 Cong., 2 Sess., 3035-41 (May 3, 1872); *Cong. Record*, 43 Cong., 2 Sess., 1390-95 (February 17, 1875).

<sup>48</sup> Paul H. Buck, *The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900* (Boston, 1937), 155-56; Albert B. Moore, "Railroad Building in Alabama During the Reconstruction Period," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), I (1935), 421-41; J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina* (New York, 1914), 448.

The Democratic party as a national institution was blamed for the "Ohio Idea," yet sentiment on this question as well as on free-silver proposals was bipartisan. The fact is that enough hard-money Democrats either co-operated with similar elements in the Republican party or remained silent while the country marched resolutely toward resumption of specie payment. If concern for the South had been the primary purpose of Democratic activity, this deflationary movement would not have been tolerated. A poverty-stricken South surely needed more rather than less credit. If years of thinking in terms of "honest money" and the demands of conservative constituencies prevented some northern Democrats from sanctioning any inflationary measure, the least which they might do as friends of the South was to support legislation which would break down the credit monopoly of the national banking system and force a redistribution of existing currency. Just such a bill was offered by Senator Sherman in his proposal to exchange U. S. 5 per cent gold bonds for greenbacks. This bill also contained a "free-banking" clause which would have resulted in some redistribution of the currency to the West and the South. Bayard regarded the bill favorably since it seemed to be a step in the direction of resumption of specie payment, and a return to national morals and honesty in individual dealings. He felt called upon to vote against the measure, however, since in its practical workings it might be inflationary, unless his amendment aimed to prevent any increase in the public debt were adopted. In effect, he recognized the currency needs of the South and would approve financial machinery to redistribute the currency but not if it added to the total debt.<sup>49</sup> On later occasions Bayard assumed the same fence-sitting posture by speaking heartily for resumption, berating greenbacks, recognizing the needs of the South, but finally opposing any legislation which might possibly result in more currency of any type.<sup>50</sup> Thurman also built himself a reputation as a hard-money Democrat, even coining the phrase "the paper-money trinity" when sarcastically

<sup>49</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 42 Cong., 3 Sess., 1065 (February 4, 1873).

<sup>50</sup> *Cong. Record*, 43 Cong., 1 Sess., 123 (December 10, 1873), 3876 (May 14, 1874); 2 Sess., 186-88, 201-202 (December 22, 1874).

referring to Senators Oliver P. Morton, John A. Logan, and Thomas W. Ferry,<sup>51</sup> yet he later supported the Bland-Allison Act in a remarkable speech.<sup>52</sup>

Randall also damned the credit monopoly of the national banking system,<sup>53</sup> but he followed the pattern of other 1870 legislators by changing his mind on currency questions as the political winds veered. On December 3, 1872, he introduced a resolution challenging the legality of a recent \$5,000,000 expansion of the legal tenders by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury William A. Richardson.<sup>54</sup> By February, 1874, he was pushing a resolution calling for the expansion of the supply of greenbacks,<sup>55</sup> but on April 9 of that year he was back in the gold column with the statement that "all here admit that resumption is desirable, in fact, imperative, within a few years." In this speech he frankly informed the South and West that their dreams on the subject were delusions.<sup>56</sup> Kerr received the support of hard-money interests in the speakership caucus of 1875, yet in 1870 he had staunchly supported the inflationary demands of the West and South in a lengthy speech on the floor of the House.<sup>57</sup> As early as June, 1870, Garfield reported to a friend a general sentiment among "Western and Southern members that they had been sacrificed by the East with the aid of the Democracy"<sup>58</sup> on currency legislation.

It is possible that this alternate silence and indecision on economic proposals might better be discussed under the heading of *missed opportunities for compromises*. Surely the Democrats held an unusual bargaining position. They might possibly have held up the acquisitive

<sup>51</sup> James Schouler, *History of the United States*, 7 vols. (Washington, 1880-1913), VII, 237.

<sup>52</sup> *Cong. Record*, 45 Cong., 2 Sess., 786-88 (February 6, 1878).

<sup>53</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., 4155 (July 25, 1866); 2 Sess., 1423 (February 21, 1867); 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 4301 (July 21, 1868); 41 Cong., 2 Sess., 190 (December 16, 1869), 1918 (March 12, 1870), 4225-27 (June 8, 1870), 5302 (July 7, 1870).

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 42 Cong., 3 Sess., 14-15 (December 3, 1872).

<sup>55</sup> *Cong. Record*, 43 Cong., 1 Sess., 1343 (February 9, 1874).

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 2964 (April 9, 1874).

<sup>57</sup> *New York Tribune*, November 20, 1875.

<sup>58</sup> Smith, *James Abram Garfield*, I, 453.

elements in the Republican party in return for greater political concessions for the South.

*Compromise* might also be defined to include those occasions when the Democrats were able to have their way by co-operating with a warring group within the opposition. A hurried search reveals four distinct techniques which were used all too seldom, considering the confused party discipline in the years when the Republican party was "making its transition from its earlier ideal of preserving the Union into the long period when its goal was the protection of the economic interests of Big Business."<sup>59</sup> These techniques were: first, combining with the extreme Radicals to defeat an amendment which was supported by moderate Republicans;<sup>60</sup> second, personal appeal within the confines of committee meetings;<sup>61</sup> third, co-operation with majority leaders in the rewriting of objectionable provisions of a law in return for a promise to cease filibustering;<sup>62</sup> and fourth, securing the tacit co-operation of "half-breed" leaders in the staging of filibusters against extreme legislation.<sup>63</sup>

Many of the activities previously mentioned might also be considered to fall within the classification of *positive action*. At first glance there may seem to be few positive steps which the woeful Democratic minority could take, especially before the readmission of the southern states and the return of a few Democrats from that section. A closer study reveals at least four definite opportunities for positive assistance: first, remove the basis for the Republican bogies; second, support or possibly initiate movements for amnesty; third, support the claims of the Texas and Pa-

<sup>59</sup> Hesselkine, *Ulysses S. Grant*, 372.

<sup>60</sup> This method, if used at the proper moment, would create the appearance of disorder and confusion. This technique was employed in the defeat of the Senate amendment changing the administration of the Military Reconstruction Act in February, 1867. See Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress*, II, 258-60.

<sup>61</sup> This is illustrated by Thurman's success in the Vance-Abbott-Ransom fight in North Carolina. Hensel, *Cleveland and Thurman*, 350.

<sup>62</sup> For example, see Smith, *James Abram Garfield*, I, 491, for description of Kerr's co-operation with Garfield on various clauses of the second Ku Klux Klan Act of June, 1872.

<sup>63</sup> See *ante*, 63.

cific Railroad Company to land grants so as to provide the South with at least one transcontinental road; and fourth, support all plans for additional appropriations of Federal money to be spent in the South.

The first of these problems was attacked by Randall when Congress met in December, 1865. He introduced and had passed a resolution declaring the Federal debt inviolate.<sup>64</sup> Later in the month he offered a resolution for a constitutional amendment which would prevent any state or the United States from levying a tax to pay the Confederate debt.<sup>65</sup> In 1872 all of Thurman's powers of ridicule and stinging sarcasm were turned on Senator Morton whose customary "key-note speech for the approaching campaign" had just been sounded. Morton had paraded "the same old cry of payment of the rebel debt; payment of pensions to rebel soldiers; re-institution of slavery; and so on to the end of the tune."<sup>66</sup> Thurman's words on this occasion completely demolished these bogies and should have made even the hard-shelled Morton squirm in his seat. Other Democratic leaders gave voice to the general agreement that the Thirteenth Amendment was here to stay, but nearly all of them fought the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments so strenuously that the South felt encouraged to resist or at least was genuinely bewildered as to the proper course to follow. Thus, the Radicals felt called upon to enforce their iron hand with a long series of atrocious pieces of legislation which grew progressively more arbitrary as the months passed. The period of exploitation might conceivably have been shortened if northern leaders had counseled acceptance of this bad bargain.

On the matter of support of amnesty the Democrats had a somewhat better record. They were continually embarrassed on this question since the Republicans often linked amnesty with proposals for other objectionable legislation. However, it seems that public opinion throughout the country was the strongest factor in forcing the Radicals to withdraw their stringent political requirements. In passing it should be noticed that, in February, 1872, Randall was successful in having the House

<sup>64</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., 10 (December 5, 1865).

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, House Report No. 9, pp. 84 ff. (December 19, 1865).

<sup>66</sup> Quoted in Hensel, *Cleveland and Thurman*, 359-65.

adopt his resolution for the removal of the political disabilities of local government officials.<sup>67</sup>

The question of whether or not the northern Democrats should have supported the Texas and Pacific job is hardly debatable. This entire project was a violation of the party's new religion of "economy." By 1871 public opinion was generally condemning any further land grants to railroads. The attempt to get around this feeling by asking for a mere guarantee of interest on the bonds of the road was another potential raid on the Federal treasury. Finally, since there was no assurance that the eastern terminus of this road would lie in the South, southern opinion was divided on the desirability of the whole scheme. Yet, the lobby was so strong that both Randall and Kerr refused to commit themselves on the project prior to the speakership caucus of 1875.

Again, economy-preaching Democrats could not work openly for any unusual appropriations, even if their constitutional principles had not been a primary obstruction. Post offices, customhouses, and the dredging of southern rivers and harbors were undoubtedly needed, but there was always the fear that a large portion of any such monies would find its way into Carpetbagger or Scalawag pockets. This fear appeared in March, 1867, when a Senate resolution actually proposed the granting of \$1,000,000 of direct relief money to the South. In the House Randall supported this resolution but Wood opposed it on principle. Later debate charged this to be for the benefit of the officers of the Freedmen's Bureau. The Democrats supported an amendment which required that the money be spent for seeds to be distributed through the Bureau.<sup>68</sup>

No presentation of developments during the years 1875-1881, when the Democrats constituted a majority in the House, would be complete without a discussion of the organization of that body. Also, it is well to recall that from 1875-1879 the Republicans in the Senate only slightly outnumbered the opposition, and that this situation was reversed in the Forty-sixth Congress, 1879-1881. When Congress met in December, 1875, Kerr was chosen by the Democratic speakership caucus in prefer-

<sup>67</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 42 Cong., 2 Sess., 830 (February 5, 1872).

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 40 Cong., 1 Sess., 83 ff. (March 13, 1867).

ence to Randall. His record of support of the South was not as spectacular as that of his rival, yet this very fact made him a logical candidate as an answer to Republican charges of excessive concern for the South by the party as a whole. Kerr organized the House with twenty-one of thirty-four committee chairmen from the former slaveholding states and none from New England. Randall, who headed Appropriations, confounded custom by assuming the functions of floorleader in preference to Morrison who presided over Ways and Means. Cox, who directed Banking and Currency, and Hewitt, a new member from New York, co-operated with Randall in the actual direction of the House as the curse of tuberculosis closed in on the fading Kerr.

To Henry Watterson the work that faced the Democratic chiefs in 1875 was plainly charted. He advised them: "There is so much to undo . . . so little to do. . . . There is a longing need to undo the lobby, tariff, executive and departmental favoritism, sectional discriminations and by a simple system of reform re-establish the government in the reverence and affection of the people."<sup>69</sup> Add to these overpowering tasks the necessity of producing Democratic leaders who, besides waging an unceasing partisan struggle to maintain their slender advantage, must suddenly develop positive qualities of real statesmanship to solve the newer economic problems facing the country, and the picture of the issues which confronted the Democrats in 1875 will be fairly complete. There was little room for strictly southern problems (even political problems) in this list, although the support of southern congressmen had been necessary to organize the House. The call seemed to have gone out that the national needs of the party were to come first. However, incomplete amnesty, the test oath for jurors, the use of the army as a *posse comitatus* at Federal elections, shaky Republican regimes in three southern states, and a limited number of United States troops in the South served as unpleasant reminders of the once ambitious program for Radical subjugation of the political life of that region. During the next six years the congressional Democrats did take steps to wipe away these remnants of "legal" lawlessness but with only partial success. In

<sup>69</sup> Louisville *Courier Journal*, February 20, 1875.

the first session of the Forty-fourth Congress they centered their attention on economy and also launched numberless investigating committees which uncovered corruption in nearly every bureau of Grant's government, but such witch-hunts did little to benefit the South except as they increased prospects for Democratic victory in 1876. The only pointed attempt to help the South (and Democratic chances of success in the approaching presidential contest) was Randall's endeavor in January, 1876, to remove the last vestiges of political disability. Failure greeted this move since Blaine's famous indictment of Jefferson Davis trapped some quick-tempered Southerners into fiery replies and forced a few moderate Republicans into line. Thus, the necessary two thirds was missed by a very narrow margin. Randall may be criticized here either on the score of overconfidence or unwillingness to compromise and allow the charges against Davis to go unanswered in return for political freedom for over seven hundred leading Southerners.<sup>70</sup>

Kerr's death in August, 1876, resulted in the elevation of Randall to the speakership. In the 1876 caucus as well as in those of 1875, 1877, and 1879 Randall relied heavily on the support of southern representatives.<sup>71</sup> It is significant that in 1879 Kentucky and Virginia produced rival southern candidates whose forte was the charge that Randall had failed to continue his policy of concern for the South and had merely used his southern friends as stepping stones to facilitate his presidential aspirations.<sup>72</sup> In the Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Congresses he shrewdly distributed his chairmanships only to those Southerners who had worked faithfully for him.

Evaluation of the course of Democratic leadership during the electoral count of 1877 is particularly difficult. Professor Allan Nevins, by implication, blames the reticent Tilden for failure to take a positive stand. It is now clear that Thurman, Bayard, Hewitt, and Randall were in

<sup>70</sup> *Cong. Record*, 44 Cong., 1 Sess., 224 (December 15, 1875), 321-30, 382-91, 420-22 (January 10, 12, 14, 1876); Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress*, II, 554.

<sup>71</sup> Randall to Chauncey F. Black, Philadelphia, July 24, August 11, 17, 18, November 2, 1875, in Jeremiah S. Black Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); *New York Times*, October 9, 1877; *New York World*, October 9, 1877.

<sup>72</sup> *New York World*, March 10, 13, 15, 1879; *New York Times*, January 8, 1878.

touch with Tilden and thought that they were following their candidate's preference for compromise by passing the Electoral Commission Act.<sup>73</sup> It is also plain that there were two distinct groups of filibusterers who threatened to prevent the completion of the count; first, an indeterminate number of disgruntled souls who early writhed under the seeming necessity of submitting to a legal steal of their election victory. Randall was definitely a member of this fraternity, as were also Wood and Thurman.<sup>74</sup> The second band appeared after February 20 in an attempt to save something from the wreckage by ending Federal interference in Florida, Louisiana, and South Carolina. Hewitt co-operated with these quasi conspirators to a point, but Randall worked with them in closest harmony until the bargain between Hayes' friends and the southern filibusterers had been signed, sealed, and delivered.<sup>75</sup> Then, and only then, did he use the great powers of his office and personality to force a completion of the count on time. Just to be sure that Hayes would live up to his expressed sentiments, the House tacked an amendment onto the Army Appropriation bill prohibiting presidential use of the army in the southern states concerned. Senate refusal to sanction this provision failed to bluff the members of the lower body who adjourned without appropriating any money for the army, thus guaranteeing a cessation of army activity after the fiscal year ended on June 30.<sup>76</sup>

The record of the Democrats when in control of the House, and later, of the Senate, on tariff, railroads, and appropriations for the South does not differ much from that of minority days. In the Forty-fifth Congress Randall replaced Morrison, a quasi freetrader, with Wood, a moderate protectionist, at the head of the Ways and Means Committee. Later the

<sup>73</sup> Nevins, *Abram S. Hewitt*, 351 ff.

<sup>74</sup> Randall to Wright, Washington, D. C., January 2, 20, February 22, 1877, in Hendrick B. Wright Papers (in possession of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.); *Cong. Record*, 44 Cong., 2 Sess., 1481-86 (February 10, 1877), 1664-65 (February 17, 1877), 1665-70 (February 19, 1877, legislative day of February 17), 1684 (February 19, 1877), 1684-91 (February 20, 1877, legislative day of February 19), 1701-16 (February 20, 1877), 1792 (February 21, 1877).

<sup>75</sup> Edward A. Burke to Governor Francis T. Nichols of Louisiana, Washington, D. C., February 27, 1877; Burke, Ellis, and Levy to *id.*, Washington, D. C., February 27, 1877, in William E. Chandler Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

<sup>76</sup> *New York Times*, February 20, 1877; Smith, *James Abram Garfield*, I, 646.

Speaker repudiated his own appointee's tariff bill when it became obvious that Pennsylvania strenuously objected to its provision for a general reduction of 20 per cent.<sup>77</sup> The party split on the Bland-Allison Act but Thurman was able to rationalize his previous statements enough to produce a brilliant speech in support of this measure of "controlled inflation."<sup>78</sup> Randall receives the blame or credit for the passage of the original Bland bill, since during a special session called for other purposes, he allowed Bland to report a currency bill from the Committee on Mines on a day when ninety-four members were absent, the absentees being largely from eastern states where elections were being held.<sup>79</sup> A half-hearted movement for repeal of resumption was voted in the House at the same time but died in a Senate committee, following the passage of a "compromise" substitute which forbade any further retirement of greenbacks.<sup>80</sup>

The Potter investigation was probably forced on the Democrats by charges which disgruntled Republicans like Senator Conkling directed against Hayes' title to the presidency. Their revelations in the press served as bait to lead the Democrats into something which promised to provide excellent ammunition for the campaign of 1880 and incidentally make heroes of the investigators.<sup>81</sup> The entire project was threshed out by joint caucuses with Randall acting as wheel horse to put the resolutions through the House. Yet the press reports of caucus meetings show Senator Thurman as the directing genius back of the movement.<sup>82</sup> This whole business disturbed many southern leaders, notably Alexander H. Stephens, who openly denounced the movement, and Hiram Young of Tennessee, who offered to the caucus an amendment which declared that it was not the object of the investigation to disturb the title to the presidency. Here we have an outright clash between the northern Democrats looking for 1880 campaign issues and southern Democrats satis-

<sup>77</sup> *New York Times*, February 10, 1878; *Philadelphia Record*, February 11, April 29, 1878; *Cong. Record*, 45 Cong., 2 Sess., 4151-70 (June 5, 1878).

<sup>78</sup> *Cong. Record*, 45 Cong., 2 Sess., 786-88 (February 6, 1878).

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 1 Sess., 241 (November 5, 1877).

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 632-33 (November 23, 1877).

<sup>81</sup> *New York World*, April 18-20, May 3, 1878; *New York Times*, May 4, 1878.

<sup>82</sup> *New York World*, May 4, 7, 10, 13, 1878.

fied with Hayes' southern policy and not wishing it disturbed. The failure of the Young amendment needs no comment.<sup>83</sup>

The short session of the Forty-fifth Congress and the following special session of the Forty-sixth were largely taken up with attempts by the Democrats to repeal the juror's test oath and the *posse comitatus* clause in the general statutes, and to prevent the illegal use of Federal supervisors and marshals in elections. In the short session a Republican Senate refused to acquiesce, while in special session President Hayes stood on guard with an endless succession of vetoes which forced virtual surrender by the Democrats. This entire campaign was woefully mismanaged in a parliamentary sense. The President expressed himself in favor of the first item, while the second was merely a printer's mistake which could have been rectified by quiet consultation. Instead the Democrats used threats and riders on appropriation bills and mistakenly linked what should have been routine legislation with dynamite like the repeal of the election laws. Garfield referred to the scheme as "Thurman's program,"<sup>84</sup> but that Ohio Senator made the mistake of exposing the repeal of the election laws in an exhaustive speech on May 15, 1879. On that occasion he quoted figures expended for the salaries of 5,000 marshals and 11,000 supervisors of elections in the contests of 1876 and 1878. Contrary to general opinion, less than 30 per cent was expended in the South in 1876 and less than 8 per cent on the same area in 1878, while the balance had been used in northern cities in closely contested districts. In fact, in 1878 over half of the balance had been spent in New York City alone.<sup>85</sup>

Thurman and his cohorts revived the struggle in the next Congress but again found Garfield and Hayes blocking their path and had to be content with the meager triumphs of repeal of the test oath for jurors<sup>86</sup>

<sup>83</sup> *New York Times*, May 14, 1878; *Philadelphia Record*, May 30, 1878; Charles R. Williams, *The Life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1914), II, 153.

<sup>84</sup> Garfield to Burke A. Hinsdale, Washington, D. C., May 20, 1879, in James A. Garfield Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

<sup>85</sup> *Cong. Record*, 46 Cong., 1 Sess., App., 90-99 (May 15, 1879); Robert G. Caldwell, *James A. Garfield* (New York, 1931), 271.

<sup>86</sup> *Cong. Record*, 46 Cong., 1 Sess., 1809-29 (June 5, 1879).

and some limitations on the use of the army at elections.<sup>87</sup> Thus the attempt of Democratic leaders to make political and personal capital out of the remnants of Radical tyranny came to an inglorious end. Repeal of the election laws was not accomplished until Cleveland's second term,<sup>88</sup> while final amnesty was granted by the Republicans during the war with Spain.<sup>89</sup> A summary of the fifteen years of Democratic activity reveals earnest attempts to protect the political and civil life of the South. These efforts were not always altruistic and many legislative battles were lost through faulty leadership and unwillingness to compromise with moderate Republicans. Especially was this the case after the Democrats had ceased to be in the minority. While notable parliamentary triumphs were few, they came at crucial moments in the history of the party. The record of their leaders on economic aid to the South is tragic. It is a blurred picture of inconsistency, inaction, and individual necessity to consider the direction of political winds from home constituencies and the nation at large. But the whole situation has not been completely clarified by this brief survey. The careers of Thurman, Bayard, Randall, and a host of other lesser lights of the Democracy must be the objects of detailed re-examination by members of the historical profession. A synthesis of such studies might provide a balanced understanding of the forces and factors which really influenced the course of legislation during these sad years.

<sup>87</sup> Walter L. Fleming, *Documentary History of Reconstruction*, 2 vols. (Cleveland, 1907), II, 431.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 432.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*

# The Fifth Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association

BY JAMES W. PATTON

The traditional hospitality of the Kentucky Bluegrass region was amply manifested at the fifth annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association, which was held at Lexington, upon the invitation of the University of Kentucky and Transylvania College, November 2-4, 1939. Two complimentary meals gave evidence of the fact that the custom of good eating still survives in that section of the South, and competently escorted tours to the stock farms in Fayette County gave the visitors an opportunity to view the beautiful landscape of the Lexington Basin and at the same time observe the surroundings and something of the habits of such distinguished Kentuckians as Man O'War and War Admiral. In addition, there were numerous private hospitalities and courtesies extended to members of the Association in the homes of individual professors at the University of Kentucky and Transylvania College.

The work of the Program Committee was greatly facilitated by the fact that the members of this committee were selected in December, 1938, thus enabling the chairman and his associates to enter upon the task of canvassing the field and arranging for papers early in 1939. A program involving some twenty-two papers, grouped in nine sessions and covering a wide variety of subjects, was prepared; and it is worth noting that of the thirty-three persons who were scheduled to appear upon the program in some capacity, every one was present at the meeting.

At the first session, which was held in the Gold Room of the La-

fayette Hotel on Thursday afternoon, November 2, three papers on the general theme of "Non-Southerners in the South" were presented, with Mack Swearingen of the Georgia State College for Women presiding. The first of these papers, read by Delbert H. Gilpatrick of Furman University, dealt with "Refugee Journalists in the South." After a general survey of the conditions in Europe which caused the migration of more than a score of English and Irish printers to the United States between 1780 and 1800, and a brief estimate of the work of these refugees in their adopted land, Professor Gilpatrick examined the careers of three of these men in some detail. John Miller, with twenty years' experience in printing, in the course of which he had been in the toils of the law five times before coming to America, printed the first daily paper in Charleston and later the first newspaper in upper South Carolina, the *Pendleton Messenger*. Joseph Gales, active in the reform movement in Sheffield, came to the United States and finally to North Carolina, where he published the *Raleigh Register* and established a "printing dynasty" in America. Dennis Driscoll, a refugee from Cork where he had attacked the whole established order in Ireland, printed a Republican paper in Baltimore and later migrated to Georgia where he published the *Augusta Chronicle* from 1804 to 1810.

In treating the subject of "Picturesque Foreigners in the Confederacy," Ella Lonn of Goucher College called attention first to General Gaspard Tochman, a Polish exile of 1830, who recruited over 1,400 foreigners for the so-called Polish Brigade and then withdrew in disgust upon learning that the high rank which he had expected was not accorded, only to reappear when he conceived a plan of recruiting the exiles who had fled into western Europe after the unsuccessful revolt of his countrymen against Russia in 1863. A group of colorful engineers of various nationalities was also described: the irascible Pole, Valery Sulakowski; the Cuban, General Ambrosio J. Gonzales; the German, Viktor von Scheliha; the Swede, Augustus Forsberg; and the Frenchman, James Nocquet, who absconded with \$150,000 and betrayed valuable information to the Federals. The British officer, St.

Leger Grenfel, who served as General John Morgan's chief-of-staff and was later imprisoned at Dry Tortugas for involvement in a plot to rescue Confederate prisoners at Camp Douglas, was listed as one of the most colorful of the many soldiers of fortune who rendered service to the Confederacy. A dramatic note was sounded in the description of Cassini, a fantastic French bandmaster, who could give instruction on nearly all instruments, and of an Irish fifer and his small son who served as a drummerboy. Among foreign clergymen was the Reverend Charles Minnigerode, who conducted Episcopalian services with a strong Teutonic accent at fashionable St. Paul's in Richmond and prayed fervently for Confederate success on the battlefield. Although surprising to some, Miss Lonn announced that the Confederates actually boasted a vivandière, in the faithful wife of a steward in the elite Washington Artillery of New Orleans, and that there were two women entered on the muster roll of a Mobile company as cantoners.

The concluding paper of the Thursday afternoon session was read by Philip D. Jordan of Miami University and was entitled "Northern Singers in the South." Professor Jordan cited the experiences of the Hutchinson family, a world-famous quartet of three brothers and a sister, as being quite the reverse of the usually warm welcome extended to northern entertainers in the South during the years following the Civil War. For nearly thirty years preceding the war the Hutchinsons had rocked the East and West with songs dedicated to woman suffrage, temperance, and abolition; and they were intimate friends, as well as co-workers, with William L. Garrison, Horace Greeley, and Nathaniel P. Rogers. Embarking upon a southern tour in March, 1870, this troupe found itself confronted with a hostile editorial and news campaign, initiated by the *Savannah Republican* and continued by newspapers in Atlanta, Nashville, and Louisville. Shunned as never before, the Hutchinsons began to collect the songs of the freedmen and were instrumental in persuading the Negroes of Fisk University to make a northern tour. The songs of the Hutchinsons, who knew little of the real nature of the South and the plantation system, are remembered

today as expressing the ultraradical abolitionist viewpoint; and also as giving the literature of American music such sectional songs as *The Slave's Appeal*, *Ho, the Car Emancipation*, and the *Negro's Lament*. In 1874, however, John Hutchinson wrote the music for Francis M. Finch's *The Blue and the Gray*, an act which did much to cause the South to forgive the Hutchinsons' earlier antislavery sentiments.

On Thursday evening, in the Ball Room of the Student Union Building at the University of Kentucky, the members of the Association were guests at a dinner tendered jointly by the Kentucky State Historical Society, the Filson Club of Louisville, the Bradford Club of Lexington, and associated historical societies. Harry V. McChesney, president of the Kentucky State Historical Society, presided on this occasion; and two papers were presented, one by Major Samuel M. Wilson of Lexington, representing the Bradford Club, and the other by Hambleton Tapp of the Louisville Male High School, representing the Filson Club.

Describing "The Supreme Court for the District of Kentucky, 1782-1792," Major Wilson stated that this court was established by Virginia for the District of Kentucky, and that it functioned for approximately ten years, between the dates indicated, as the highest court of Kentucky. The importance of the court lay in the fact that it was a court of general jurisdiction for the entire District of Kentucky, superior to all other courts within the district and subordinate only to the Court of Appeals and High Court of Chancery of Virginia. With the exception of the organization meeting, which took place at Harrodsburg, all sessions of the court throughout its existence were held in Danville, and Danville was consequently the center of legal and political life in the district as long as the court was located there. The court, said Major Wilson, was an influential tribunal, and a considerable amount of important business was transacted by it. Upon the formation of the new state of Kentucky in 1792, this court was superseded by the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, which was located first in Lexington but later moved to Frankfort as the permanent capital of the state.

In analyzing "The Wickliffe-Breckinridge Controversy of the Thirties," Hambleton Tapp explained that this controversy attracted wide

interest because of the prominence of the contestants and the vitality of the issues involved. Robert Wickliffe was at this time the most prominent land lawyer and the wealthiest planter in Kentucky. Robert J. Breckinridge, admired in both America and England for his intellectual achievements, was an able minister of the Presbyterian church and one of the outstanding controversialists of his day. The contest was both personal and political and was characterized by denunciation and slander. It was personal in that the two men quarreled over the handling of the estate of Breckinridge's father; political in that the two, disagreeing on the question of slavery, sought to secure the adoption of their respective views by the voters of Kentucky. The dispute relative to slavery formed the most important feature of the controversy and revolved around the following issues: (1) the African colonization movement; (2) the Non-importation law of 1833; (3) gradual emancipation; and (4) involvement of the churches in the emancipation movement. During the controversy, Wickliffe's arguments appear to have had more influence with the state electorate than did those of his opponent, although Breckinridge was the superior logician and rhetorician. But Wickliffe died in 1859, while Breckinridge lived to experience the termination of slavery throughout the nation.

Two sessions were held concurrently on Friday morning. One of these was devoted to consideration of "Southern Indians" and was held in the Ball Room of the Phoenix Hotel, with James W. Moffitt, secretary of the Oklahoma Historical Society, presiding. Peter A. Brannon of the Alabama State Archives discussed "The Contribution of the American Indian to the Culture of the South." As outstanding among such contributions, Mr. Brannon listed tobacco, maize and other important food products of the South, America's original artificial fertilizer, and a number of chemical alkaloidal medicines. Other products attributable to the Indian include cornpone, the hoecake, hominy, roasting ears, sweet potatoes, baked and roasted, and that practically universal and characteristically southern article, barbecued meat. The art of the American Indian was identified with the typical shapes, textures, and colors of present-day ceramics. Recent archaeological investigations

were cited by Mr. Brannon as demonstrating that the primitive home life of the Indian influenced southern pioneer life entirely and modern rural life to a considerable extent. The thatched interwoven fences of the rural South, the former stockaded mound post of military defense, the stick-and-dirt chimney, the puncheon floors of early houses, smoked meat, dried fish, and many other Indian customs were not only handed down but have been accepted and continue to be a part of our economic life.

In a paper on "Sequoyah's Contribution to Cherokee Culture," Morris L. Wardell of the University of Oklahoma described the educational and literary developments that took place among the Cherokee in consequence of the invention of Sequoyah's alphabet. By 1828, seven years after the invention, virtually all the Cherokee could read and write. Many young men and a few young women attended mission schools and, upon becoming teachers, aided in the spread of both white and Cherokee culture. A newspaper, the *Phoenix*, and translations of parts of the Bible appeared in Cherokee homes. Following the removal to Indian Territory, hundreds of young men and women, after attending the Cherokee public schools, were given a classical education in the seminaries established by missionaries at Tahlequah in 1847. The Mission Press at Park Hill printed in Cherokee millions of pages of books, primers, hymns, the Bible, an almanac, and whatever else was educational or literary. In 1844 a second newspaper, the *Cherokee Advocate*, was established as a successor to the *Phoenix*. It was printed partly in English and partly in Cherokee, and its editor asserted, soon after its beginning, that he could count on the fingers of his two hands all adult Cherokee who could not read either Cherokee or English. All of this, said Professor Wardell, was largely the result of Sequoyah's invention of the Cherokee alphabet.

With the aid of moving pictures, T. M. N. Lewis of the University of Tennessee described recent "Archaeological Discoveries in the Tennessee Valley." During the past three years the University of Tennessee Division of Anthropology, in co-operation with several Federal agencies and national scientific societies, has excavated a number of

prehistoric village sites and earthworks on the Tennessee, Hiwassee, Ocoee, and Little Tennessee rivers. The remains and artifacts uncovered by this work indicate that the first inhabitants of the Tennessee area were prehistoric migrants from the Great Lakes region. These people were semisedentary, nomadic groups, who were chiefly dependent upon game, fish, and shellfish for subsistence, and their huts can best be described as temporary brush arbors of crude construction. Burial of the dead followed a pattern practiced by many of the ancient peoples of the earth, as far back as Neolithic times. In the course of time another wave of people suddenly inundated this area from the west and proceeded to exterminate and absorb these earlier inhabitants. The newcomers were a highly sedentary people who lived in rather large villages, fortified with stockades, and their huts were of comparatively permanent construction. These people apparently possessed a well-organized political system. Design elements embodied in their arts suggest an affiliation with the pre-Mayan Middle American cultures of approximately 300 A.D., implying the probability that these people, or their ancestors, migrated from Middle America, or at least that a strong stream of cultural influence from that area affected their mode of living. Pre-Mayan religious beliefs also appear to have been assimilated. The bone and shell industries were exceptionally well developed, and some of the pottery designs have come down into historic times in the practices of the Cherokee.

At the other Friday morning session, which was held in the Gold Room of the Lafayette Hotel, with William G. Bean of Washington and Lee University presiding, the papers were built around a central theme of "Economic History of the Old South." In discussing "Ante-Bellum Attempts to Regulate the Price and Supply of Cotton," Thomas P. Govan of the University of the South emphasized a project initiated by John G. Gamble of Florida and James Hamilton, Jr., of South Carolina, in 1839, the purpose of which was to establish a means whereby the planters of the South could hold back a part of the supply of cotton from the European market when the demand was low, so that the price would remain constant and profitable. Gamble and Hamilton wanted

the banks of the South to make advances on cotton at a prearranged price. The cotton would then be shipped to warehouses in Liverpool and Havre, there to be held until it could be profitably marketed. The plan was never put into operation, because of financial difficulties experienced by the American banks and the economic disorders in Europe during the period from 1839 to 1841, and it had no permanent effect upon the course of the cotton trade. The episode was interpreted by Professor Govan as demonstrating that in the Old South as well as the New, some of the planters believed that an organization was needed to control supply in the interest of price; and also that the planters were apparently not devoted to the abstract principle of free trade, but opposed the high tariff simply because it was injurious to their interests.

J. Carlyle Sitterson of the University of North Carolina outlined the problems of "Financing and Marketing the Sugar Crop of the Old South." Adequate credit was of particular importance in the production of sugar, because of the large capital requirements and the uncertainties attending the cultivation of this crop in the South. The main sources of credit were listed by Professor Sitterson as: (1) commercial banks; (2) planters with money to lend; (3) wholesale supply dealers; and (4) the commission agents or factors. The factor was the most important of these agencies, usually obtaining his capital from his personal funds, the endorsements of friends, the credit of wholesalers, and the credit balances of his planter customers. The great bulk of the sugar crop was shipped by boat from the plantations to factors in New Orleans, who saw to the sale of sugar and molasses at auction on the levee. About 50 per cent of the Louisiana crop was purchased for consumption in the West, 30 to 35 per cent was shipped to eastern refiners, and the remainder was either consumed or refined in Louisiana and adjoining areas. Perhaps the greatest deficiency in the financing and marketing of the ante-bellum sugar crop was the absence of any organization that purported to advance and regulate the commercial phases of the sugar industry.

The concluding paper at this session was read by J. Harold Easterby of the College of Charleston and was entitled "The South Carolina

Rice Factor as Revealed in the Papers of Robert F. W. Allston." Proceeding upon the basis of an abundant store of records left by Allston, a prominent rice planter of Georgetown District, Professor Easterby examined, for the period from 1808 to 1867, the relations which existed between the rice planter and the factor who sold the crop, bought the supplies, and attended to a thousand odds and ends for the planter in the Charleston market. Charleston, rather than Georgetown, became the factorage center for the Georgetown planters, chiefly because the former city was more successful in extending its transportation facilities and building up large mercantile establishments. The rice was shipped by schooner and steamboat directly from the plantations to the factors' wharves in Charleston, and there sold to "rice buyers" representing merchants in foreign as well as domestic markets. During the Civil War the ocean route to Charleston was closed, and the planters were forced to ship their rice by river to various points on the railroad which had meanwhile penetrated the Georgetown hinterland. From the standpoint of plantation finance, Professor Easterby asserted, the record of the rice factor is more creditable than those of the agents who handled the South's cotton and tobacco crops. The rice factor seems to have been willing to render many services extending throughout the entire year in return for a commission which averaged about 2.7 per cent of the gross receipts from the sale of the crop—a compensation which does not appear to have been a serious burden on the industry.

Following the morning sessions on Friday, the members of the Association assembled at a luncheon conference, in the Gold Room of the Lafayette Hotel, for the purpose of holding the annual business meeting and electing officers. The report of the Secretary-Treasurer was read and approved, and the following officers were chosen for 1940: president, Frank L. Owsley of Vanderbilt University; vice-president, Benjamin B. Kendrick of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina; secretary-treasurer, James W. Patton of Converse College.

On Friday afternoon a general session on "The Civil War and Re-

construction" was held in the Gold Room of the Lafayette Hotel, with Jonathan T. Dorris of the Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College presiding. This session was attended by a large crowd, including a number of nonmembers of the Association, and the papers were received with much interest. Irrational aspects of the Civil War were emphasized by James G. Randall of the University of Illinois. Presenting a paper on the theme "The Civil War Restudied," he showed that the slavery question was trivial, in that real interests were not threatened. Slavery would not go into the territories, and the number of escaping slaves was small. Yet the question was tragically important as a political troublemaker. It is a misconception, he said, to suppose that the Republicans in 1860-1861 were standing firm on an antislavery principle. In Congress the Republicans favored repeal of the "personal liberty laws" and refrained from prohibiting slavery in territories that were organized in 1861, thus confirming the contention that the whole quarrel related to "an imaginary Negro in an impossible place." Nor was it a case of the whole broad issue of slavery being bound up in the territorial question. The defect in this reasoning is to be found in two factors: Republican complacency as to slavery in the South, and the party advantage of having what seemed a large issue, not as a thing to settle but as a thing to agitate, so that politicians could skirt the subject without grappling with it. Referring to the Civil War as "a prolific field for misconceptions," Professor Randall asserted that Lincoln and Douglas had far more in common than has usually been supposed; that the popular vote in 1864 "settled nothing"; and that the Emancipation Proclamation "had significance more as a slogan than as a measure." There is no assured answer, he said, to the question what "would have" happened to slavery if there had been no war, although it was pointed out that so far as there has been a genuine evolution away from slavery as compared with "paper abolition," this has come through southern action rather than northern compulsion. During the war, said Professor Randall, minds that should have been kept serene were swept into excesses of intolerance and hate. Advocates of peace were caught in a cruel dilemma, and peace proposals seemed

a kind of defeatism. Thus the Civil War emerges as a thing of twisted ideology, which must be restudied in the light of social and human realities and not in terms of legalistic attitudes.

On the subject of "Rewriting the History of Reconstruction," Howard K. Beale of the University of North Carolina called attention to the need for new studies and a changed point of view in order to arrive at a full understanding of this period. Reconstruction, he said, must be studied in its setting; many of the same forces at work were controlling men both earlier and later in American history and in other parts of the nation at the same period. The Northerners who came south should be studied as one of the many population movements in our history; they should be differentiated as to motives, types, and interests. Also the period should be re-examined in terms of a two-fold revolutionary hypothesis: that an agrarian group heretofore dominant in the nation was overthrown by an industrial and urban interest; and that simultaneously in the South the large propertyholders' control of political, economic, and social life, based on slave labor, was displaced by a more democratic way of life. It is important, asserted Professor Beale, to see who profited from Radical Reconstruction. Part of the debts left by the Radicals resulted from extravagances, but the major portion of these debts financed railroad building and other business ventures from which in many cases conservative white Southerners benefited. Likewise, Bourbons who followed the Radicals in power were frequently men of business interests which they hoped to favor by control of southern governments, and in some states white supremacy meant the supremacy of a combination of old planters and industrialists over the great majority of small, white farmers. As to the democratic phase of the revolution within the South, Professor Beale suggested that many of the difficulties under Radical rule arose from no inherent wickedness on the part of the Radicals but from the fact that a region habituated to aristocratic control had been suddenly democratized. The Carpetbaggers, Scalawags, and Negroes need to be restudied to see why they were interested in Radical power and why they as poorer men did not profit more from this democratic revolution. Finally, Professor

Beale stated that an analysis of the Bourbon governments that followed the Radicals will indicate that the former succeeded no better than the latter in serving well the majority of white Southerners or in establishing satisfactory democracy in the South.

Respective comments upon the papers by Professor Randall and Professor Beale were made by Harvey M. Rice of Ohio State University and Francis B. Simkins of the State Teachers College, Farmville, Virginia. Professor Rice suggested the possibility that Professor Randall had minimized the significance of economic forces as a cause of the Civil War, and advanced the thesis that widespread southern disapproval of nationalistic economic policies benefiting the North and West might have driven the South to war even if slavery had not been an issue. He also discussed the question of whether the war had any real effect upon the complex problem of race relationships in the South; and with regard to whether slavery would have been forced out of existence without the war, suggested that there was sufficient uncultivated soil in the South in 1860 to have saddled the section with the slave system for many decades. Although endorsing Professor Beale's arguments in general, Professor Simkins insisted that the doctrine of class struggle should not be emphasized at the expense of race consciousness in interpreting the Reconstruction period. A balanced appraisal of the complex character of this period, he said, should take into consideration other factors than political issues and their economic motivations; and there should be a fuller understanding of the emotional and psychological causes for the southern aversion to the experiment of the Negro in politics.

The fifth annual dinner of the Association was held on Friday evening, November 3, in the Ball Room of the Phoenix Hotel. Frank L. McVey, president of the University of Kentucky, presided on this occasion and, after a few words of welcome, introduced Charles S. Sydnor of Duke University, the president of the Association, who delivered his presidential address, "The Southerner and the Laws," which is printed elsewhere in this issue.

On Saturday morning two sessions were again held simultaneously.

One of these, meeting in the Red Room of the Lafayette Hotel, was concerned with some "Aspects of Southern Religious History," with William W. Sweet of the University of Chicago as chairman. Henry T. Shanks of Birmingham-Southern College read the first paper, "The Reunion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1865." Following a brief account of the history of the Episcopal church set up in the Confederacy by the southern dioceses during the Civil War, Professor Shanks outlined the factors which contributed to the return of the southern dioceses to the national church. A group of bold leaders, North and South, realizing the danger of delay, undertook immediately upon the collapse of the Confederacy to bring about the restoration of the church as it existed before secession. Henry J. Hopkins, the presiding bishop, supported by several other clergymen inaugurated a campaign to induce the southern dioceses to send delegates to the General Triennial Convention of 1865. Despite the opposition of Virginia and the Lower South, this invitation was accepted by Texas, Tennessee, and North Carolina. The convention, although not as harmonious as formerly pictured, was, in the face of contemporary bitterness, exceptionally peaceful. As a result of the conciliatory spirit displayed in the convention, there was an immediate return to the old church of most southern dioceses, and the ultimate reunion of the whole church. The Protestant Episcopal church, therefore, escaped the Reconstruction bitterness which characterized the experiences of other large Protestant denominations.

Oliver S. Heckman of the Pennsylvania State Department of Education examined the activities of "The Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., in Southern Reconstruction, 1860-1880." Failing to make any significant progress with their plan of disintegrating and absorbing the southern Presbyterian church, said Mr. Heckman, the northern Presbyterians turned their attention to the Negroes who had assumed a new status as a result of the war. Efforts in this direction were at first concentrated upon providing physical necessities, evangelization, and church extension, but later upon an attempt to reach the Negroes through an educated, colored ministry. By 1880 twelve permanent institutions of learning had been established by the northern Presbyterians in the

former slave states. These institutions gave first place to educating ministers and teachers, and students were enrolled in large numbers. But, since its services did not generally allow the emotional expression which the Negroes desired, the Presbyterian church was not particularly adapted to making converts among the colored people. Moreover, there were many ministers and members in the North who did not approve of the southern penetration policy of their denomination, and the southern Presbyterians looked upon the northern religious emissaries as social and political troublemakers. It was the conclusion of Mr. Heckman that the southern policy of the northern Presbyterians contributed to delay the reunion of the northern and southern branches of this denomination.

Concluding the session with a paper on "Recent Trends in Southern Methodism," Hunter D. Farish of Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, suggested that a transformation is being effected in the social character of this denomination in the South. Emphasizing the broadly representative character of the membership in the past, he called attention to certain conditions, such as personal and experimental religion and the simplicity of Methodist forms of worship, which have enabled Methodist communicants of every walk of life to worship harmoniously together within a common fold. But with the shifting of emphasis in the denomination from the old theme of personal salvation to the enunciation of a social gospel, and the decline of the old Methodist aversion to formality in favor of liturgical tendencies, Mr. Farish raised the question whether certain elements among the Methodists may not be inclined increasingly to seek more congenial surroundings for worship elsewhere in the future, and thus alter the broadly representative character by which the denomination has formerly been identified.

At the other session on Saturday morning, meeting in the Gold Room of the Lafayette Hotel with D. D. Wallace of Wofford College as chairman, attention was directed to the problem of "Southern Relations with Europe." On the question of "The Influence of French Diplomatic Policy on the Annexation of Texas," Richard A. McLemore of the State Teachers College, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, presented a study

based upon documents in the Archives des Affaires Etrangères in Paris, which have only recently been opened to scholars. These materials suggest that the French did not wish to see the United States strengthened by the addition of Texas, and that they were equally determined not to let Great Britain profit from a successful policy of opposition to annexation. In this situation, France co-operated with Great Britain in making known to the United States her opposition to annexation, but was unwilling to adopt more vigorous measures for fear of alienating the United States. Unable, therefore, to gain French support for a more aggressive policy, Britain was compelled to modify her opposition to the American project, thus enabling the United States to complete the annexation of Texas with a minimum of interference from foreign powers.

Thomas P. Martin of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress discussed the wider aspects of "The Cotton Question at Home and Abroad, 1849-1861." New England and other northern merchants and manufacturers, he pointed out, were objecting to the extension of slavery in the territories at the same time as the British were opposing slaveholding in South Africa, and for the same reason: namely, that under a slave economy the thousands of laborers would be kept at a bare subsistence level and therefore unable to develop wants for the various kinds of cotton cloth. Northern business men also objected to the rise of cotton mills in the South, which seemed to threaten a shift of the coarse goods manufacture to that section, thus leaving the New England manufacturers to a stiff competition with the British, French, and German producers of fine goods and special articles such as hosiery. Finding that their southern contemporaries would yield to no arguments for a protective tariff on fine cotton goods, these merchants and manufacturers turned to the new Republican party, which was rising in the West, and succeeded in converting that party to a policy of protection. The possibility that Negro slave labor would be adapted to cotton manufacture in the South made good propaganda for the northern press, concluded Mr. Martin, for most of the operatives in the cotton mills of Massachusetts were "the fair and virtuous daughters of the

Old Bay State," and the prospect of reducing these "to the same level with the colored races" was made as black as possible.

On the subject "A Georgian at the Court of the Hapsburgs," C. Lee Harwell of Emory Junior College concluded the session with a sketch of William Henry Stiles, who served as chargé d'affaires of the United States at Vienna, 1845-1849. This period was significant in view of the seemingly aggressive foreign policy of the United States, and the Revolutions of 1848-1849; and Stiles, as a representative of the plantation slaveholding aristocracy of the South, presents an interesting study amidst such far-reaching developments. In his careful observations of European ideas and customs, Stiles repeatedly pointed out the superiority of Americans and especially of Southerners. In his attempts to justify the action of the United States with regard to the Oregon question and the Mexican War, he insisted that these policies did not represent an aggressive attitude on the part of his countrymen. He was bitter toward the Europeans for their lack of sympathy with the United States, which he attributed largely to the English press. The high light of Stiles' ministry came in 1848-1849, when the revolutionary government of Hungary appealed to him to serve as an intermediary between that government and Austria. His efforts to bring about an understanding between these two governments failed. He was successful in his hopes of bringing the United States to realize the commercial possibilities of various parts of the Austrian Empire, but, regarding his appointment as political, he was glad to be relieved after the defeat of the Democrats in 1848.

The meeting was brought to a close on Saturday noon at a luncheon conference on southern literature, tendered by Transylvania College with President Raymond F. McLain presiding. Franklin J. Meine of Chicago spoke interestingly and humorously on "Southern Story-Telling in the New York *Spirit of the Times*, 1835-1860." Mr. Meine exhibited an original copy of an early issue of this magazine, described its general nature, and indicated something of the type of material which it printed. The *Spirit of the Times* was a sporting journal, edited by William T. Porter, and was characterized as an "omnium gatherum"

of American wit and humor of the so-called "Big Bear" school. Many of the stories which were carried in its pages, both originals and reprints, are known to have come from the South, but a considerable number appeared under pseudonyms of authors who have not been identified. Mr. Meine requested the assistance of southern scholars in the problem of identifying these pseudonyms.

John D. Wade of the University of Georgia followed Mr. Meine with an essay on "The South and the European Thought-Drift." Pointing out the fact that there seem to be definite modes of thought which dominate western civilization as proper explanations of life, he stated that except for the fact that the South never submitted to the ascendancy of Puritanism, its thought-modes remained fairly well abreast of those in England until around 1825. After about 1825, while Europe was engrossed by the conflict of labor and capital and of science and religion, the South, preoccupied, turned to a contemplation of medievalism and of classic Greece and Rome. The rise of realism in Europe, induced largely by the effects of the industrialization of European life, was influential in America chiefly north of the Potomac where the conditions of life were suggestive of those considered in realistic pronouncements. But cosmopolitan influences if not actual conditions have induced in the South at last the thought-modes springing from the great European realists. And dominant conditions, similarly inspired by cosmopolitan influences, have even induced among us thought-modes that sprang up in Europe largely as a reaction to the realistic approach now perhaps waning. And this means, naturally, that the South seems to be at last again in the general current of western culture.

In conclusion, it may be said that the various sessions were well attended, and that more than average interest in the respective papers was maintained. One hundred and seventy-six persons were officially registered, in addition to quite a large group of Lexington people and students of the local institutions who were present at one or more of the sessions as visitors.

## Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer

The Secretary-Treasurer is happy to report that the business affairs of the Association are in a most prosperous condition. Membership has increased more rapidly than in any previous year since the first year after organization and, in spite of larger outlays for publishing than heretofore, the treasury has more than a thousand dollar surplus for 1939. The routine activities of the Association have followed a normal course. The committees and officials have performed their duties in a most acceptable manner and have graciously rendered the Secretary every assistance possible. I wish to commend especially Mr. James W. Patton of the program committee; Messrs. Thomas D. Clark and F. Garvin Davenport of the local arrangements committee; and Mr. Alfred J. Hanna of the membership committee. All have rendered efficient service in their respective fields and deserve the thanks of the Association.

Individual members of the Association have shown an unusual degree of interest in the activities and progress of the year's work. Several have sent in to the office names of persons whom they thought might be interested in joining the Association. One sent in four names. The Secretary wrote each of them and three of the four have become members. One of the three, a distinguished lawyer, wrote that he appreciated the honor of being invited to join an organization that was doing so much to advance the cause of historical scholarship in the South. Another member recommended an able editor of a newspaper who has since become a member. I might multiply the examples but these illustrate how individual members of the Association can aid in its growth and influence.

The work of the Association continues to arouse interest and praise

among those who are not members. Officers of local historical societies are beginning to look to the Association for leadership. Several have written the Secretary about its work and have voluntarily given favorable publicity to the annual meetings of the Association. An officer in a large publishing firm wrote an officer of the National Educational Association that the Southern Historical Association had "an unusually interesting program this year [1939]. . . . I hope you may be able to go, or at least to join the organization, which is worthy of support by everybody, especially by those of us who hail from the South and are particularly interested in Southern history." I give you these comments so that you may know what others think of your Association and its work.

The *Journal of Southern History*, under the able editorship of Professor Wendell H. Stephenson, is of course the most important work of the Association. It has not only held its enviable position among scholarly journals but has also added to its fame. "Splendid publication," "scholarly journal," and "best publication in the field of American history," are some of the phrases used to describe the *Journal* by people writing to this office.

The Secretary has assisted several organizations in their efforts to further historical activities. He furnished mailing lists to the Editor of "Medieval Studies in the United States and Canada"; to the Department of Archives of Louisiana State University; and to the Southern Book Company, a firm specializing in Southern and Confederate Americana. He has also been called upon to supply a copy of the constitution of the Association to serve as a guide in framing a constitution for another body, and to offer "any words of wisdom or advice which might aid . . . in the task."

I had one call for aid which I was unable to render. A man wrote to ask that the Secretary of the Southern Historical Association "dig up my ancestral tree." He knew that he had an ancestor who "received a mortal [*sic*] wound at Kings Mountain Battle in the American Revolution" and felt sure that "family genealogies" had been "placed in your Association Library." I modestly declined to undertake the exca-

vation and courteously explained to him that the Association had not, as yet, begun the collection of family genealogies.

The most important work of this office is connected with membership and finances. Last year I reported 740 active members. Since January 1, 1939, 20 of these have been dropped for nonpayment of dues, 17 have resigned, and 1, Mr. Alex Camp of Dallas, Texas, has died. This makes a total loss of 38. Under the enthusiastic leadership of Mr. A. J. Hanna, the membership committee and the Secretary have added 156 new members and 6 members who had resigned have renewed their affiliation. This is a net gain of 124 for the year and gives a total of 864 active members. Of the old members, however, 46 are in arrears for 1939 annual dues, and this in spite of the fact that the Secretary sent each of them three separate notices. The Association has 4 life members. In addition to the 864 active members there are 66 exchanges, giving a grand total of 930.

The membership is widely scattered. Active members are found in 38 states, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Canada, France, and Argentina. Twenty-three states have above 10 members. In order, they are: North Carolina, 69; Louisiana, 67; Virginia, 60; Florida, 56; Alabama, 54; Georgia, 51; Tennessee and Texas, 50 each; Mississippi, 46; District of Columbia, 45; Kentucky, 42; South Carolina, 35; New York, 32; Illinois, 21; Ohio, 15; Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, 16 each; Arkansas, 15; Indiana, Maryland, and Oklahoma, 14 each; Missouri, 13; and West Virginia, 12. The bulk of the membership, however, is concentrated in the region south of Mason and Dixon's line. Furthermore, library memberships make up the larger portion of the membership of those states in the Old Northwest and the Middle Atlantic region which do have a sizeable membership. As the Association grows older and the *Journal* gains wider recognition we can confidently look forward to an expanding membership.

Among the active members are famous lawyers and architects, internationally-known literary figures, judges of state Supreme Courts, ministers, and ambassadors, as well as high school and college teachers and professional historians. We may note that the membership includes

about 250 libraries, among them being 10 high school libraries and public, college, and state libraries. Among individual members, men outnumber women by more than three to one.

The Secretary would like to suggest to the members of the Association that they, individually, can do much to increase the membership of our organization. Personal contacts of members with those who might be interested in the work of the Association can be used much more effectively than random correspondence of the membership committee. I believe graduate students, young instructors, lawyers, and libraries (public, school, and college) constitute the most fertile field of cultivation for new members. Many of you teach in a school or college whose library does not subscribe for the *Journal of Southern History*. You have friends who would gladly join the Association if you only called it to their attention. If you believe in the Association and its *Journal*, sell it to others.

At a meeting of the executive council held at Lexington, Kentucky, on November 3, 1939, Robert S. Cotterill and Robert H. Woody were, upon recommendation of the Managing Editor, elected to the editorial board of the *Journal of Southern History* to fill the vacancies caused by the retirement of William O. Lynch and John D. Barnhart. The council also considered the matter of expanding the programs of the annual meetings so as to make an appeal to men in the European history field. After thorough discussion the council authorized the incoming President, Frank L. Owsley, to appoint a committee made up of members of the Association whose chief interest is European history to study the matter and report to council members attending the Washington meeting of the American Historical Association, December 28, 29, and 30.

The Association in annual business session at Lexington, Kentucky, on November 3, 1939, elected the following officers for 1940: president, Frank L. Owsley; vice-president, B. B. Kendrick; secretary-treasurer, James W. Patton; executive council, Minnie Clare Boyd and Fletcher M. Green to a full term, and B. I. Wiley to fill out the unexpired term of B. B. Kendrick who becomes an ex-officio member of the council.

The Association is on a sound financial basis. Expenses for the year are paid and there is a cash balance of \$1,118.10 for 1939.

# FINANCIAL STATEMENT AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1939

## RECEIPTS: January 1 to December 31, 1939

Cash balance, January 1, 1939.....	\$4,999.57	
Interest on savings account.....	108.30	
Profits from annual meeting.....	61.35	
Annual dues collected.....	2,308.21	
Total.....		\$7,477.43

## DISBURSEMENTS: January 1 to December 31, 1939

Printing February and May issues of the <i>Journal of Southern History</i> .....	\$1,130.55	
Printing membership blanks, receipts, and materials for the membership committee.....	56.25	
Stationary and supplies.....	11.97	
Typing.....	10.90	
Mimeographing membership lists.....	14.75	
Printing programs.....	20.50	
Mailing programs.....	18.54	
Expenses, membership committee.....	22.01	
Expenses, program committee.....	8.72	
Notary public fees.....	2.25	
Bad checks.....	7.00	
Express, membership committee supplies.....	1.57	
Telegrams.....	2.84	
Postage and incidentals.....	51.91	
Total.....		\$1,359.76
Balance on hand, December 31, 1939.....		\$6,117.67

## BALANCE DISTRIBUTED AS FOLLOWS:

Savings account, Bank of Chapel Hill.....	5,075.80	
Checking account, Bank of Chapel Hill.....	1,041.87	
Total.....		\$6,117.67

Since I am retiring from this office at this time, I would like to offer a brief summary of the growth of the Association for the past five years. Organized in Atlanta, Georgia, on November 2, 1934, the Asso-

ciation had a membership of 354 and a cash balance of \$1,155.41 when I took office on January 1, 1936. By December 31, 1936, the membership had increased to 537, the Treasurer had spent \$181.13, and the Association had a balance of \$2,807.90. On December 31, 1937, the membership was 645, expenses \$860.03, and the balance was \$3,942.87. The Association paid for the printing of one issue of the *Journal* in 1937 which accounts for the increased expenditures. December 31, 1938, the membership was 740, expenses \$1,336.15, and the balance was \$4,999.57. The Association paid for the printing of two issues of the *Journal* in 1938. On December 31, 1939, the membership was 864, the expenses for 1939 were \$1,359.76, and the balance in the treasury was \$6,117.67. This statement shows that the Association has experienced a steady growth both in membership and financial stability. A tabular statement will make this growth more evident.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Members</i>	<i>Increase</i>	<i>Expenses</i>	<i>Balance</i>	<i>Increase</i>
1935	354	...	Not reported	\$1,155.41	.....
1936	537	183	\$ 181.13	2,807.90	\$1,652.49
1937	645	108	860.03 (Paid for 1 issue of <i>Journal</i> )	3,942.87	1,034.97
1938	740	95	1,336.15 (Paid for 2 issues of <i>Journal</i> )	4,999.57	1,056.70
1939	864	124	1,359.76 (Paid for 2 issues of <i>Journal</i> )	6,117.67	1,118.10

Respectfully submitted,

FLETCHER M. GREEN, *Secretary-Treasurer*

December 31, 1939

# Notes and Documents

LETTERS TO AND FROM JACOB THOMPSON

EDITED BY P. L. RAINWATER

The story of Jacob Thompson's career in the quarter-century before 1860 is but an etching on the background of a growing, developing new region in the deep South. In 1835 the twenty-five-year-old graduate of the University of North Carolina and member of the bar of that state set out on horseback for the Old Natchez Region in Mississippi. This region had proven to be the springboard for many capable and aspiring young men who, after a single decade in Natchez, had been catapulted out of poverty into wealth and political position.

Such, for instance, had been the good fortune of George Poindexter, John A. Quitman, Robert J. Walker, and others. And what had these men that Jacob Thompson did not have? He, too, was young, courageous, and capable. Having arrived at Columbus in North Mississippi, Jacob was diverted, by a chance meeting with his older brother, Dr. Young Thompson, who had preceded him to the new country, from Natchez to the frontier town of Pontotoc in the heart of the Chickasaw country. Here was a lawyer's paradise. The northern half of Mississippi had but recently been opened to white settlement by the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit with the Choctaw in 1830 and the Treaty of Pontotoc with the Chickasaw in 1832. To facilitate the removal of the Indians and the sale of the recently acquired lands to the whites, the United States government established at Pontotoc an Indian agency and a land office. Land-hungry immigrants poured into the new region like air into a vacuum. Besides the Indian who was playing fast and loose with money recently received from the United States for his land, there

were in the new region outlaws, adventurers, traders, land speculators, and gentlemen from Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee with their slaves. Money flowed freely and business prospered. In this environment Thompson's law business prospered from the first, and in two years it was extensive and remunerative. From the vantage point of a successful practice, he entered politics. He was six times elected to Congress and in 1857 entered Buchanan's cabinet as secretary of the interior. But a large plantation and slaves was the goal of every southern gentleman's ambition. Thompson's early law practice was chiefly concerned with land titles and conveyances. He became land conscious. In 1837, when the Chickasaw cession was divided into ten counties, Thompson took part in organizing circuit courts in these counties. While thus engaged at Oxford, a thriving settlement thirty-five miles east of Pontotoc in Lafayette County, he investigated the purchase of fertile and cheap land in the vicinity of Oxford. Here he made his first purchase in 1837. Here, too, he formed the acquaintance of John Peyton Jones, in whose home he was frequently a guest,<sup>1</sup> and met Jones' fourteen-year-old daughter Kate, whom he married in 1840.

The young Congressman now moved from Pontotoc to Oxford, where he began the construction of a mansion and suitable outhouses and gardens. Meanwhile, he was campaigning in Mississippi for Van Buren and getting his wife off to Paris, where she attended school for four years. For the next decade Thompson was continuously in Congress. At home his planting interests became extensive. In 1850 he owned in Lafayette County 2,400 acres of land valued at \$10,000 and farm implements worth \$2,600. His plantation produced 500 bushels of corn

<sup>1</sup> In 1836 Jones bought a section of land on Woodson's Ridge, eight miles from Oxford, for \$5,760. Lafayette County, Deed Record, A, 223. This and all other Lafayette County court records used in editing these letters are preserved in the courthouse at Oxford, Mississippi.

In 1850 Jones owned in Lafayette County 3,200 acres of land valued at \$16,000, and farm implements valued at \$2,300. In the same year he raised on this land 6,000 bushels of corn and 53 bales of cotton. Mississippi Agricultural Production, Original Returns, Census of 1850 (MS. in Department of Archives and History, Jackson, Mississippi). For a description of Jones' home, see Dorothy Z. Oldham, "Life of Jacob Thompson" (M. A. thesis, University of Mississippi, 1934), 35-36.

and 120 bales of cotton. Ten years later his plantation produced more than any other in the county. He then owned 2,500 acres valued at \$50,000 and farm implements valued at \$7,000; and his plantation produced in 1860, 5,000 bushels of corn and 392 bales of cotton.<sup>2</sup> The transfer of property which he made to his son Caswell Macon Thompson in 1864, as a result of his Canadian mission as secret agent of the Confederacy, shows how extensive his landholdings were.<sup>3</sup> After the war Caswell retransferred the property to his father who retained it until his death in Memphis, Tennessee, on March 24, 1885. Thompson's will<sup>4</sup> shows that at the time of his death he owned stock in numerous corporations, including \$100,000 in the Bell Telephone Company. Unlike most Southerners who were wealthy in 1860, Thompson was able to retain his property through the era of war and reconstruction.

The following letters<sup>5</sup> are particularly interesting and revealing because they shed light upon Thompson's home environment in North

<sup>2</sup> Mississippi Agricultural Production, Original Returns, Census of 1860 (MS. in Department of Archives and History, Jackson, Mississippi).

<sup>3</sup> Lafayette County, Deed Record, K, 288, thus describes the property transferred to Caswell M. Thompson:

"The Oxford tract and the lots in the said town of Oxford known as the home place, containing some five hundred and fifty acres more or less, also, the Clear Creek plantation lying and being in the County of Lafayette, and containing some twenty-seven hundred & twenty acres, more or less; also, the Mississippi plantation lying on the bank of the Mississippi River & being in the County of Coahoma containing seventeen hundred & eighty-three acres more or less, also, all the uncultivated land of every description whatever lying & being in the Counties of Panola, Tunica, Coahoma, Tallahatchie, Sunflower & Bolivar. To have & to hold the same to him & his heirs forever in fee simple free from the claim or claims of all persons whomsoever, also, all negroes owned by me, whether they be found in [the] State of Mississippi, or Texas, or any where else, as fully and perfectly as if they were all specially & specifically name[d], also all my stock of horses, mules, cattle, hogs & sheep, wherever the same may be. To have & to hold the whole in his own right, as his own absolute property & for his own use & benefit. This conveyance however is made subject to this condition that one-third interest of the property hereby conveyed and assigned to the said C. Macon Thompson is to be held in Trust, for the use and benefit of his mother Catherine A. Thompson, subject to her control and to be assigned and punctually delivered over to her whenever she shall desire the same to be apportioned and set apart for her."

<sup>4</sup> Lafayette County, Will Book, II, 23-30.

<sup>5</sup> All of the manuscript letters here printed, with the exception of Jacob Thompson's communication to J. F. H. Claiborne, June 3, 1878, are in private possession.

Carolina, the rise of the young politician in the deep South, and his relation to the Civil War and the Reconstruction periods.

Leasburg, North Carolina

April 9, 1884

My dear Brother Jacob,

In upsetting and turning out the contents of an old drawer in furniture that was once our father's, and that has been in my possession since his death, among other old letters and papers, I found the enclosed, which I send to you after the lapse of half a century to be reread by you.

The perusal of them gave me great pleasure, and also to my family. I was much impressed with our father's reticence in giving counsel and his exhibition and reliance upon an all-wise Providence, and his thankfulness for any and all blessings bestowed upon him and us. I knew that during the latter portion of my father's life, his daily custom was to read some portion of Scriptures, and that his life and conversation were alike exemplary. But I was not aware that in earlier life, he was religiously inclined for he never became a member of any church, and rarely have I ever heard him discuss religious questions. I am very sure these letters will carry you back to when all of life was before you, and you had scarcely begun [*sic*] to climb to that elevated place it was your good fortune to reach, and which now, as life is ebbing, you can enjoy.

At this time, my family is quite well. We would be very glad to have a letter from you and Dear Sister Kate, to whom give our best love.

I am your affectionate brother,

GEORGE N. THOMPSON

Leasburg [North Carolina]

4th May 1828

Sir I send you 4¼ yds of Cloth that will make you Cote panteloons and jacket the Merchant says there is Trimmings for them all Except the Buttons for the Jacket which you can get. I have been to Church this Day and if I understand the good Divine he says and I Believe it to—that if a persons hart is not Right towards the Great Giver of all Good that his works will not prosper. So I would Advise you for all the honours you Receive and All the fine things Thank the God of Jacob, of Old—Not Man—

I inclose you Ten Dollars which will pay for Making your Clothes and the Ballance you can Save. We are all well—Thanks be to the giver of all Blessings.

N[ICHOLAS] THOMPSON

Leasburg [North Carolina]

19th September 1828

Sir This day I Recd a few lines from you Saying that you had looked for a few lines from me to give you some Direction You know my [views] and all the Bairing points in my advice. Humility because it is a Duty you ow to God. Obedience to your Rulors if you think it nessery for Rulers it is really Necessary that their order should be to. Industry and Economy Because it is the Strait Road to Honors & Wealth and A Contented mind Which is Better than—Vice and immorality is the Strait Road to poverty and disgrace. Employ your time well. So that you Can not 10 years after say O, if I only had my time to go over I would do so and so. How simple that is. Never look back. Employ each hour well and if it do not turn out well you feel Cleir that you have don your Duty which is comfort.

Your situation in life is at this time a good one if improved if Not—

Knowledge is Strenth & Wealth, if a parrent can give his Son Strenth & Wealth What more Need he want. Our Female School is going on very well. We have about 20 students. Sarah Has not Those Brooks [evidently the family name of students who excelled Sarah] to keep above her now so she keeps head—and she is well pleased with the School. We have finished Burning the Brush. We have no apples to lay up this fall. We will have fine cribs of corn in this Section for Whitch blessings we Should be Thankfull to the great Giver of all Blessings. We are all well Thank God.

N THOMPSON

Leasburg [North Carolina]

9th September 1832

Sir I recvd [a letter] per Wm Bullock with Fifty Dollars inclosed Thirty of them I gave you Credit for Whitch is all the money you got of me to go to the Springs With. You stated that you was owing G. W. Lea \$6.25. Whitch I have not paid but will, that will leave \$13.75 in my hands of your money Whitch I will get Mr. W. A. Lea to take if he will—The South Carolina money is good. it is going at parr about this place— you Stated something about leaving the hill [Chapel Hill] for good about the End of this year. I have no Objections i am sure it is a nuff for me to rase my Children to the arrive at Twenty-one years Clir of any Bad habbits—and then I dont think I should point out any course for them to do—Except an upright humble course to God our Maker and preserver. Any other course it is far from me to Direct. I dont want you to say Nor any Child that I may rais if it had not becn for Father I would have Don So and So— Any advice that I have given or any direction I want you to set them down Nothing Because you have arrive at full

age to Dictate for your self. Gaston gave an Eligant Idea to young men on that Subject— he says Every man should make his own fortune and Not depend on others— one thing you should know you have to make a living for your Self Not for me— You say something about teaching John, William and Sarah [two brothers and a sister] Would it be Right for me to take John from School from his class for six monts only— William and Sarah I am entirely Willing you Should Teach Them and Master Lawrence Also we will Cleir out the Red house Where thare is a Nice fireplace whare you may heir thar lessons.

I Recd a few days past a letter from Brother Joseph dated at the same place he dated the one to James Y. [a brother of Jacob's] He says his health gits no Beter and he Will Return home by the way of Nashvill and Wishes me to send Young [James Y.] on to him, and he Will interduce him to All his Relations about that place and to some of the first Carrecters about Nashvill. You say something about my purchasing a Carrage of some kind. I have thought about it for sometime and would have Bought one Before this [but as] We live in a Back Woods We must send to the North for our Carrages and I have no acquaintances to the North that I would relion to purchase one. I have been Enquiring about the price and I would have bought one long sine If I could got one in this section. Mr. Wiley says I should have one you say I should have one. Sidney says it would be money spent—I say it has a tendency to spile Boys and Girls they will be a Taulking about Thair Fathers Carrage etc. It is more Cumfortable to rise than to fall. Your Mother has been Sick this Weak but is now well. Mr. Newel Cate is very unwell. He has kept his bed for 2 or 3 weaks back and seemes to be geting no better. Thare is great preperctions making about the Campmeeting near this place. I remain yours etc.

N THOMPSON

Leasburg [North Carolina]

20th November 1832

Sir I Have just recd a Note by Mr. Terre Stating that you looked for a letter from me—in answer to a former letter to me in that letter it semes you have Decided on a profession, and you have 2 plans in vew one is to remain at the Hill [University of North Carolina] six months longer, or Return home and stay nine monts & then go to Some Law School if I would furnish you with money. i have Not give you as much as I inten I have given J. T. [a son, John] about \$2000 James Y. about \$3000 and I intend to Make Ann [Ann Eliza, a daughter] up to \$2000 and I will Not Stop Short of \$2000 with you if I am Blest with Luck— I would not even Stop at the above sum to complete you in any profession— But Take Notice—All your Brothers

and Sisters are to have as much as [you] Before you will Receive any More. that is I must provide for young ones—I am now old and inactive. if I understand your letter you want to no My opinion whether you should stay at the Hill longer or Return to Leasburg— I am not Able to Council you, Neither would I wish to do so because I mout be Rong and be blamed—but My General Advice is to move Slow that is make as few moves in life as possible when he is doing Nothing then move—

I would think this place not a favorable place to Study any profession— Altho I am not Capable of Council on Such Subjects— Your Decition will plesse me or I will [be] properly Satisfied with your Decition— this is the time of the year that I am busy getting in our Crops fatning hogs etc. Selling Leather buying hides— I have Not seen Joseph Since I Recvd your Letter this Evening. About his horse if he will not let you have him, I will Rubup that Boyle horse for you he will pass Right Well. Salls Belly is two big or I would send hir She is in fine order—

[NICHOLAS THOMPSON]

Memphis, Tennessee

June 3rd, 1878

My dear Claiborne,\*

The incident referred to in your postal card led to such consequences to other individuals that in writing to you a sketch of my public life I merely mentioned it and passed on. But now as succinctly as I can, I will give you all the facts, although in doing so I fear you will deem me too egotistical.

The great question in 1844 was the annexation of Texas. Nothing contributed more to the force of this question on the minds of the Democratic party than the address of R. J. Walker in the spring of 1844 on this subject issued in circular form. My relations at that time with Mr. Walker were most intimate, and in preparing it I was very often in his room; every part or paragraph was submitted to my criticism and after my suggestion adopted. I was thoroughly committed to stand by the address. When Mr. Van Buren took ground adverse

\* A portion of this letter, the original of which is in the University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, is quoted, or rather misquoted, by J. F. H. Claiborne, in *Mississippi as a Province, Territory and State* (Jackson, 1880), 439. The portion of the letter used by Claiborne is given below to exhibit an unwarrantable editorial liberty:

"My relations with Robert J. Walker were intimate and confidential. We co-operated in getting up his annexation letter, and in the movement to shelve Van Buren and substitute Polk. When Polk was elected, Walker informed me, that he had applied for a place in the cabinet, and the President had replied that he could only offer him the post of Attorney General. I protested against this, and said, 'we secured Polk's nomination, and you can only accept the State Department or the Treasury.' He insisted that it was better to take the Attorney Generalship than to have nothing. I declared I would see Mr. Polk! He begged me to do so, but said, 'get what you can, but don't decline the

to the admission of Texas it was after the convention of Mississippi had instructed the Delegation in the Baltimore Convention to support him for the nomination of President. My colleagues and myself at once determined being Delegates, to disobey instructions. I went to Mr. Walker and got him to join us in an address to our constituents advising them of our determination. We all knew that unless we could defeat Mr. Van Buren's nomination this movement would prove our political death. There were not a few at home who at first condemned our course. But we succeeded. Polk was nominated. Walker was put forth to do the speaking of our Delegation in the Convention. I became prominent only by my decisive course and firmness in duping Mr. Walker from yielding to any compromise. When Polk was elected, Walker came to me and said he wished to become a member of his cabinet; he wanted my help. My relations with Pres. Polk prior [to that time] were good; I might say intimate. I promised Mr. Walker my zealous support. I told him I must manage the matter in my own way, except that I would join the whole delegation in a general letter to the President. Governor [Albert G.] Brown in the meantime wrote me if I thought that Mr. Walker would get a place in the Cabinet. I replied I thought he would succeed. Knowing that a session of the Senate would be called on 5th March and wishing Mississippi to be represented in that session, he filled up a commission appointing me Senator to fill the vacancy made by Robert J. Walker, leaving the date blank. This he forwarded to Mr. Walker. On the 3rd of March 1845, Mr. Walker came to me confidentially and told me President Polk had just informed him that the only thing he could do for him [Walker] was to give him the office of Attorney General. I felt indignant and told Mr. Walker in plain terms that after we had made the

Attorney Generalship, if you can't do better.' I did see Mr. Polk on the night of the 3d March. He re-cast the cabinet, and assigned Walker to the Treasury, and pledged himself that his name should be thus sent to the senate. I went to Walker at a late hour the same night, and told him how the matter stood. He was overwhelmed with emotion; seized me with both hands, and said, 'Oh, Thompson, you are my best friend. Your zeal and firmness have saved me. I can never, never forget you.'

"At that very moment, and for some time previous, he had my commission to succeed him in the Senate, in his pocket, and he never said a word to me on the subject! I remained in Washington until Walker was installed in the Treasury, in intimate communion with him every day. I left him with his kindest wishes and warm expressions of friendship and obligation, and not one word did I hear of the commission till I met Gov. Brown in Mississippi! Gov. Brown wished me to accept it, but I had been unanimously re-nominated for Congress, and had accepted it, and I declined to change my position. I wrongly blamed William M. Gwin at the time, and had likewise with him a controversy on another subject, but subsequently our relations became very friendly. I never recognized Walker afterwards. He was a man devoid of fixed principles, controlled by any man who had decision and will. He had a fertile genius, as readily employed on one side of a question as another. He was true to a friend, so far only as that friend could serve him. He always claimed that he used his colleagues as puppets, when in fact, they used him as clerk and man-of-all-work."

fight for the office of Secretary of State or Secretary of Treasury, for him now to take the office of Attorney General was to let him down and was no better than defeat. He argued with me at great length, that he had better take it than to be defeated altogether. I told him that I was surprised at this position and he would take it with my most earnest protest, both to him and the President. He requested me then to see the President but not to decline for him the office of Attorney General. I did see the President on the night of the 3rd. and saw him alone. I told him as his friend I insisted that he recast his Cabinet. That he was about to do heinous injustice to my friend. He took his list while I was present and formed and reformed it and finally putting in Mr. Walker as Secretary of the Treasury, wrote out the other names, and assured me so it should stand. I went to Mr. Walker that very night and told him how matters stood, and that the President had assured me he would not change it. He seized me by the hand, thanked me, and said my zeal and unwillingness to yield had saved him from a mortification to which he had made up his mind to submit. At that very moment he had a commission for me in his possession but said not one word about it. The Senate met. I stayed in Washington until Walker was installed in office and left him with his good wishes as I supposed warmly expressed. Now for the explanation. When I returned home in March, 1845, I found myself unanimously renominated for Congress, and immediately I accepted the nomination. Then it was Governor Brown invited me to meet him in Grenada, Mississippi. I did so. He told me how he had issued the commission, that Mr. [William M.] Gwin had strongly urged him to appoint him, that Walker was in favor of Gwin's appointment, that he had declined to do so and was surprised, that Walker had not delivered the Senatorial commission to me, and he then wished me to accept it. Gwin, he said, would be a candidate for the Senate, [John A.] Quitman, [Henry S.] Foote and some . . . . [manuscript illegible] I told him had the commission come into my hands while I was at Washington I should have accepted it and thanked him, but now I had accepted the nomination of the Convention and I would not embarrass the party by forcing them to make a new nomination. At my suggestion he then and there appointed Judge [Joseph W.] Chalmers to fill the vacancy. At that time Dr. Gwin had felt himself greatly aggrieved with me because I had opposed and defeated a bill in which he was deeply interested which on its face purported to be for the relief of the Chickasaw Indians. This led to a serious controversy between Gwin and myself which terminated in Gwin sending me a challenge. I called in General Quitman and Jeff Davis as my friends and they adjusted the matter without a meeting. The result to both Walker and Gwin of this controversy—I was returned to Congress by the largest popular majority ever received by any man in the State up to that time. Walker never came back to the State, Gwin left and finally settled in California. I never spoke to either Walker or Gwin until I was a member of Buchanan's Cabinet. That

is we never spoke from 1845 to 1861. And then for awhile only on official business.

But while I became reconciled entirely to Gwin, I never could tolerate Walker. He was a man devoid of opinions of his own, controlled by any man who had will and decision; he had a fertile genius as readily employed on one side of the question as the other. He was true to a friend only so far as that friend could serve him in his designs. With his colleagues he always claimed that he used them as puppets, when they got him really to act as clerk.

I shall be glad at all times to hear from you. I fear in this explanation I have been dull and tedious.

Your friend,

J. THOMPSON

Dublin, Ireland

Aug. 11th, 1866.

TO CAPT. WILLIAM DELAY<sup>1</sup>—*My Dear Sir:* Your interesting letter of 16th ult. was received by me on yesterday, and the only way in which I can manifest the unqualified pleasure it gave me is by making you an immediate reply. I never knew until I was cast out an exile without home, or country, and apparently without friends, how necessary to human happiness is human sympathy. A stranger in a strange land caring for nobody, nobody caring for me, I determined for my pleasure and improvement, to visit the principal scenes of historic interest and thus familiarize myself with the story of those who had gone before me. I went to Paris (which take it all in all is the pleasantest city in the world), and there remained until I could re-read her history and learn something of the French language. Then I went to Switzerland and visited the retreats of the different distinguished exiles who, in the violence of party, had been driven from their country to this place of quiet and safety. I went to Rome, the home of the greatest men and purest patriots whose history adorns the annals of the past, and there remained two months industriously employed all the time in examining the ruins of former greatness and grandeur, never feeling the slightest interest in the living, but absorbed with thoughts, principles and actions of the mighty dead. Then I went to the delightful city of Naples, delightful for its climate and situation, not for its people; here was the seat of Royalty now in banishment. Then to Egypt, the cradle of letters and learning,

<sup>1</sup> This letter to William DeLay was published in the Oxford *Falcon*, September 6, 1866. DeLay was born in Bourbon County, Kentucky, on May 3, 1814. He moved to Oxford, Mississippi, about 1846 and established and edited the *Falcon*, an important Democratic newspaper in northern Mississippi. Later he gave up newspaper work to become probate clerk of Lafayette County. DeLay served in the Black Hawk, Mexican, and Civil wars. He died at Oxford, September 15, 1871.

then to Palestine to tread the ground our Savior trod, to see the places where he performed his glorious works, to climb the sides of Mount [of] Olive[s], to stand on Mount Calvary, drink the waters from the pool of Siloam and gaze upon the tomb where they laid his body and which could only retain it for its appointed time. From here I think I came away a better man. I returned through the Greek Isles, of vast interest to the student, up the Adriatic to Venice, a most singular place with a most marvelous history. Thence through Vienna, Munich, Frankfort, Cologne, Brussels to Paris again. Here Mrs. Thompson left—yearning to see the land we both have loved and love still; but I could not go with her and why? Was it because I feared to meet there the penalties of offended law? Was it because trials might be instituted and proofs adduced which would affix a stigma upon my name? *No!* It was because I felt there was no constitution or law in the South for the protection of my rights. It was because the arbitrary will of an officer guided by prejudice and passion which have been excited by the grossest slanders and foulest falsehoods, might arrest, incarcerate and in a thousand ways annoy me and I could have no remedy. When civil rights are restored, when the military officer becomes subject to the law and for any violation of the rights of the citizen, the courts will have the power to inflict upon him condign punishment, then will I be happy to return and take my old friends by the hand. For I assure you, that with all her faults, I love my country. There is no other such country in the world. I have visited every kingdom and people which have any position among the nations of the earth and with the intention, if ever I could find an acceptable place, to settle down and gather my little family around me and there in quiet spend the remnant of my days, but I find no place in which I am willing to leave my family. No, for good or evil the best country is in the United States and if there could only be security of person, property and reputation it would be the most desirable country on earth. At all events those dependent upon me I want them to remain and abide the fate and destiny of their country. What shall become of me is of but little consequence, my days of usefulness are past. My sun is fast hastening to its setting, but my will shall be that when life's fitful fever is over, my body shall be buried beneath the soil which has been fattened with the blood of my ancestors in the struggle for its independence. With these feelings you can easily imagine how highly I appreciate any evidence of kindness and good will from those who are to keep vigils over my grave. Your petition is well intended, I am thankful to each and every one who signed it. I regard it as friendship's offering; but I fear it will be unavailing. Indeed it will be of no use. Mr. Johnson is or may be well disposed, but yielding to the suggestions of a deep designing malignancy on the part of others, he has inflicted upon me a gross injustice; he has done me a grievous wrong in denouncing me as an *escaped felon*. I believe he knows and feels it, but I fear he is like all other men the more groundless the reasons for his injury, the more

obstinate he will be in refusing to make reparation. Moreover the President cannot act for fear of the denunciations of the Radicals, if he were ever so well disposed. I would be unwilling to embarrass him with anything on my account, for I honestly believe if he succeeds there is some hope for the country. If he fails, the constitution is buried, civil rights will become bywords, Liberty is gone and a deep gloom of inevitable darkness hangs over the destiny of the greatest people in the world. I weigh not my own fate as a feather in the balance; I only hope to live until I shall have power under the law to prosecute the perjurer and inflict punishment upon those who have wronged me. And although I have knelt at the tomb of our Saviour, yet I fear that the punishment that awaits the evil doer in the next world will be too long in its coming.

I am glad to hear of the rebuilding of Oxford<sup>8</sup> and of its prosperity of the successful operation of the University, and of the return of those who were called away by the war. I hope you will remember me to my friends. I am glad Sam Thompson<sup>9</sup> has a paper in operation; I shall be glad to learn of his success. I have not yet seen whether you have any where in the South full liberty of speech. I hope hereafter we shall have no party but in all elections personal qualifications shall be the tests of all candidates.

Since Mrs. Thompson left me, I have been running over Scotland to see the ruins of its old castles and its celebrated scenery and a few days since I entered Ireland, and to my surprise I find here one of the most beautiful agricultural countries I have ever visited. Tomorrow I go to the Lakes of Killarney.

Now that you have begun I hope you will continue to write for everything in relation to our people is of deep interest to me. Could you not occasionally send me a copy of Sam Thompson's paper?

Your friend,

J. THOMPSON.

Halifax, N. S.

Oct. 8th, 1867.

My dear Howry:<sup>10</sup>

Your very acceptable letter of July was received just as I was on the eve of leaving Halifax for Europe with Mason. This is the reason of my delay in not replying to you. I hope however you will not follow my example, and I promise that if you reply promptly to my letter, you shall have no advantage of me in the future. Your letters are always refreshing to me. I regret very much

<sup>8</sup> All the business houses in Oxford, except one, and many of the homes of citizens, including Jacob Thompson's, were burned by Federal troops under command of A. J. Smith, on August 22, 1864.

<sup>9</sup> Editor of the *Oxford Falcon* which resumed publication in August, 1865. He was not related to Jacob Thompson's family.

<sup>10</sup> James M. Howry was born in Botetourt County, Virginia, on August 4, 1804. The Howry family soon migrated to East Tennessee. At the age of twenty-two young James

you did not extend your contemplated visit to Boston to Halifax. I live, it is true, in a rented house, but I have a spare room for a friend and there are a thousand and one things on which I would like to exchange ideas. There are some reasons why I should like to return to Mississippi. There are many there with whom I would like to exchange salutations. There is one gone however whom I liked, which is one link broken which bound me to the locality—I mean Judge Peterson.<sup>11</sup> For his family I feel the deepest sympathy; would to God I could minister to their temporary comforts. I should like to know their present situation and how they manage to live. I am glad to hear of the prosperity of the College [the University of Mississippi], and I hope the characteristics of our people are not to be changed with the change of Institutions. I do not object to your filling my place in the Board of Trustees. When I thought I possessed a large fortune, I intended to divide my estate with the University, but now things have changed. I have given all I had in Mississippi absolutely to my son, Macon, and if he manages this property well, he is bound to wind up with a firm estate. Here I live cheaply but pleasantly. My only objection to the place is that I am too far removed from my old friends—that those who would cannot visit me. Next spring, I sometimes think, I will go up to Canada, and if I can find a suitable place, I will buy where I shall be in two days communication with Mississippi. For I shall never return to the State until I can come invested with all the rights of a freeman. I have been subjected to slanders and persecutions by many of those in office until I feel a perfect loathing and contempt for many of them. When in Paris I formed the acquaintance of Judge Ord, who is the brother of Gen. [Edward O. C.] Ord. He offered to do anything in his power with his brother for me. I refused to consent that he should do anything, not because I have no confidence in the General,—indeed, I have more in him than in any other of the commanders of the Military Districts—but because I could not avail myself of any pledges he might give me. To be ruled by Negroes is bad enough, but to be ruled by vile abolitionists is intolerable. I have so much confidence in Gen. Ord that I would prefer to live in the State with supreme power vested in him than to

settled near Nashville, but in 1836 he removed to Oxford, Mississippi. While in Tennessee he was admitted to the bar, and in 1834 was married to Narcissa Bowen whose father had gone into the Indian country of North Mississippi prospecting for lands two years earlier. He attended the land sales at Pontotoc and bought three sections on the Tallahatchie River. He also bought land near Oxford which he gave to his daughter Narcissa. This was the beginning of the Howry estate which by 1860 consisted of nine hundred acres well stocked with slaves. Howry also built up a lucrative law practice. From 1844 to 1870 he was a member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Mississippi. He died at Oxford, April 15, 1884.

<sup>11</sup> Andrew Peterson was judge of the Probate Court of Lafayette County. He died on March 26, 1867. Edward O. C. Ord, military commander of the district, refused to permit the election of his successor until after the registration of voters provided by the congressional act of March 2, 1867. See Lafayette County, Probate Minute Book, VIII, 326.

live there with the negroes in the ascendant. [James L.] Alcorn<sup>12</sup> has but one principle, the five loaves and two fishes; but he will be unable to hold the State.

I have great confidence in [William L.] Sharkey.<sup>13</sup> His instincts are all right. Oh, how I would like to see Col. Young,<sup>14</sup> Col. Brown,<sup>15</sup> Thom. Pegues,<sup>16</sup> and Judge Clayton.<sup>17</sup> But this cannot be now. I saw President Davis not long since. His health was fair and he seemed to be cheerful as usual. Gen. [Philip H.] Sheridan seems to be carrying the North by storm. The demonstration made in his favor seems to be intended as a popular outburst against Johnson. The Northern people seem to entertain a fixed dislike of the South, and they are determined to make them feel subjugated. I believe Johnson's heart is now right, but he has not shown the nerve I thought he possessed. This Congress has shorn him of all power, and the efforts he is making now in defense of the constitutional rights of the people only result in drawing the chord tighter. The absurdity of a President not possessing the power to call around him the Constitutional advisers in whom he has confidence.

Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. [John Peyton] Jones [Thompson's mother-in-law] and myself are all in excellent health. We all desire to be remembered in the most affectionate terms to you, Mrs. Howry, and the family. Macon reports that your boys are doing well, which I am very glad to hear. If our friend, Capt. DeLay, is disfranchised, how will he be able to hold office? The Confederates who are settled here, and there are a goodly number, are all doing well. They all express themselves in very strong terms against returning to communities controlled by negroes.

Write me soon.

Your friend,

J. THOMPSON.

<sup>12</sup> See Franklin L. Riley, "James Lusk Alcorn," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1927-1938), I, 137-39.

<sup>13</sup> See Charles S. Sydnor, "William Lewis Sharkey," *ibid.*, XVII, 21-22.

<sup>14</sup> George H. Young was born in Oglethorpe County, Georgia, in 1799. He studied at Franklin College, later to become the University of Georgia, and at Columbia College, New York, where he received a degree. He was admitted to the Georgia bar and practiced law in the state until 1835 when he removed to Mississippi. Purchasing land in Lowndes County, he built a mansion which he called "Waverly," a mecca for many distinguished visitors. Young served as a member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Mississippi from 1848 to 1870, and was for a time a member of the state legislature.

<sup>15</sup> James Brown settled in Lafayette County, Mississippi, in 1836, and by the following year had purchased 11½ sections of land for \$11,040. In 1860 he owned 2,200 acres of land in the county, valued at \$30,000, and farm implements worth \$2,500. From 1846 to 1870 he served as a trustee of the University of Mississippi.

<sup>16</sup> Thomas Pegues was a Lafayette County planter and a member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Mississippi from 1860 to 1875.

<sup>17</sup> Alexander M. Clayton was born in Campbell County, Virginia, on January 15, 1801. After reading law at Fredericksburg, he was admitted to the bar in 1823. He practiced

48 Morris St.

Halifax, N. S.

May 4th, 1868

My dear Howry:

Your letter of the 12th of March was duly received. It proved very interesting as all your letters do. It seemed to me like a picture deguerotyping [*sic*] the state of the Country. Sometimes I wish I were among you, then again I am glad I am away as I could do nothing to help anybody and could have no influence (not the least) in public matters. The Northern mind seems to take pleasure in hearing that their measures are bringing ruin and misery upon our best people. When I consider them fellow-citizens, I turn to them with loathing and contempt. But there is a portion of the Northern people who are just and true and faithful to liberty. But I fear they are in a woeful minority. Poor Johnson, I begin to feel a deep commiseration for him. He began his administration by the most unholy acts of injustice. He denounced men as innocent as himself and as honorable as assassins. Under the influence of popular prejudice he hung an innocent woman, but now that he sees that he has been used and made a fool of, he attempts to set himself right before the Country and *in foro conscientiae*; he is impeached and degraded. These are strange times and he is a true philosopher who bears it all with patience and equanimity. For myself, I say "Blow winds and crack your cheeks." I bid you defiance. I have spent the winter here pleasantly and in a few days we will start for Montreal. I go there so as to be in more direct communication with my friends in Mississippi. I doubt whether the society will be as agreeable there as here, but I have my wife and Mrs. Jones with me, and I know they will feel more at home there than here. The next letter you write me direct to Portland Place, Montreal, and I hope you will come North this summer and will come there and visit us. It would give me so much pleasure to have you spend a few days with me. I will always have a spare room and bed for you and any of the family you may bring with you. There is one favor I would ask of you as a Mason. Although I can work myself into a lodge here, yet I would like for you to grant me a regular certificate of membership in the Oxford Lodge so I might enter the Lodges at Montreal. I do not wish even in this to accept any thing as a favor and you know I am not bright [in Masonry]. Your statement to Commander Davis of this place gave me ready admittance to all the Lodges.

Give my love to Mrs. Howry and the family. I am not surprised that Avent [a former neighbor in Oxford, and in 1860 one of the wealthy planters in the

law at Clarksville, Tennessee, until 1837, except for one year which he served as United States judge for the territory of Arkansas. Removing to Marshall County, Mississippi, in 1837, he built up a lucrative law practice, served as judge of the High Court of Errors and Appeals from 1842 to 1851, as a member of the Nashville and Baltimore conventions, and as a representative from Marshall County in the Mississippi convention of 1861. From 1844 to 1852 he was a member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Mississippi. He died in October, 1889.

county] is a bankrupt, but I feel very sorry for Col. Brown. A man who has spent so arduous and industrious a life deserved a better end. Do you ever hear from my old friend Col. Young? I received a letter a few days since from Prof. [Albert Taylor] Bledsoe.<sup>18</sup> His Southern Journal is the best periodical in the United States.

Write me soon.

Your friend,

J. THOMPSON

From *The Weekly Delta*,<sup>19</sup> May 12, 1869

JACOB THOMPSON, who, through fear or disgust, left the country at the time of the surrender, has returned to his home at Oxford. On his arrival he was received by his old neighbors, and was addressed by Colonel [L. Q. C.] LAMAR in their behalf. About the time Mississippi seceded, this gentleman, if we mistake not, wrote a letter to the *Oxford Intelligencer*, in which he declared that after the independence of the Confederacy was achieved, no Union man nor old-line Whig should hold office in the State until the expiration of two years. In less than half that time MR. THOMPSON found it necessary to run away from the country, and after wandering a great while in a foreign land, returned to his home, and found his former servants in the enjoyment of political rights, which he, perhaps, will not possess for some time yet in the future. What is sauce for the goose, is of course, sauce for the gander. Read the following extract from JACOB's speech:

"But here you ask me, and very pertinently, why I have not returned among you earlier. This question, you at once perceive, leads me into the field of politics into a review of the action of the Government and the conduct of its officials. There I am in the condition of an unfortunate Irishman, who was a sailor on board of a ship at sea, and the captain ordered him aloft to arrange some part of the rigging. After reaching a considerable height on the main-mast his hold gave way and down he came on the deck with a heavy crash. The captain, frightened, ran to him, and in sympathizing tones said, 'Patrick, are you dead?' 'No,' said Pat, 'I am not dead, but I am spachless!' In Pat's condition, I find myself at this time in regard to politics and the management of the government for the last four years—I am speechless. In the late struggle for self government, we went to sea in a hastily constructed boat, which, for four years, gallantly bore the buffetings and beatings of the winds and waves, and finally went down amid the breakers, attracting the admiration of the world.

<sup>18</sup> See Edwin Mims, "Albert Taylor Bledsoe," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, II, 364-65.

<sup>19</sup> Friar's Point *Weekly Delta*, May 12, 1869. Friar's Point, Coahoma County, was the home of Alcorn, the principal leader of the Mississippi Radical Republicans in 1869. The *Weekly Delta* was an enthusiastic supporter of Alcorn and the Republican party.

We, the passengers, were thrown out into the turbulent waters, and have been gradually picked up and hauled on board the ship *Nationality*, where we are permitted to breathe and live, but not allowed any lot or employment in sailing the new ship on which we are embarked. Few of us can hold office; a greater number cannot vote. Possibly this is for the best, and in the end will prove a great blessing. You are relieved of all the responsibility in helping to govern the country. Purer and better and wiser citizens, in their own estimation at least, will freely undertake to discharge all the onerous duties of office and relieve you from all its anxieties and perplexities."

Memphis, Tennessee

William Thompson<sup>20</sup>

February 3rd, 1875

My dear Brother,

I returned from St. Louis last night. Sally's<sup>21</sup> taking the mules away will produce great confusion on Woodson's Ridge. It will break any man on earth to buy mules to let renters have them and then buy corn to feed them. The hands on Woodson's Ridge must get along with the minimum amount of mule force. But I wish you would inquire around and let me know at what price you could get two or three mules which have not had all the life beaten out of them. As for a negro's paying for a mule, that is absurd.

As to Walton's cotton, it is most absurd when you say he has only two bales to think of paying mule rent before land rent and ration rent, and when he pays his ration a/c he has not a bit of cotton for land rent; and when his land rent is paid, he has not a pound to pay his ration a/c. Walton is busted and I claim the two bales for land rent. I have sold none of the Woodson Ridge cotton. I have been waiting until it all comes in. I can then make a better sale I think with uniform staple and uniform handling. Abe owes two for rent and at least another for ration a/c, and I want you to insist on it. All are in but Va. George and Albert Hill. Urge Wilson to make them bring them in.

You take the right view as to the rails. I can only pay for the rails on the fence, and when these are put up, I will pay for them. You will have to get us some corn.

Write me about the mules and whether you have the negroes on making fence. We are well. Love to all.

Yours affectionately,

J. THOMPSON

<sup>20</sup> William Thompson, Jacob's brother, was a lawyer at Oxford, Mississippi.

<sup>21</sup> The widow of Jacob Thompson's deceased son, Caswell M. Thompson.

## Book Reviews

*Religion and the State in Georgia in the Eighteenth Century.* By Reba Carolyn Strickland. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. 211. Bibliography. \$2.50.)

This study endeavors to show what part religion played in the founding and development of government in Georgia of the eighteenth century. Further, an attempt is made to trace the policies of this government as they affected religion and to point out how the various religious sects influenced the Revolutionary cause. The writer has found (through extensive use of the *Colonial Records of Georgia*) that, even in the Colonial period, Georgia was most generous in her treatment of the various religious sects, excepting the Roman Catholics. The suppression of the Roman Catholics resulted from the general opposition to them in England and from fear of their facilitating an invasion of Georgia by the Spanish and French to the south and southwest. No one church maintained supremacy in colonial Georgia; although certain special privileges were extended to the Church of England from time to time, these were, for the most part, soon enjoyed by the other sects.

Since religion was seemingly such an important factor in influencing the people of Georgia to support the Revolutionary cause, the reader will be disappointed in finding only scant references to the actions of the various religious groups in this connection. Especially one would like to have found a more complete account of the activities and influence of the Congregationalists. Certainly the addition of information on this subject would have immeasurably improved the value of the study.

The general style is of a high caliber and therefore one is surprised to find such expressions as "This 'little sister' among the thirteen original states" (p. 183); and "were the darling settlers of the Trustees' hearts" (p. 71). Also, the enumeration of numbers of "indefatigable," "ardent," and "untiring" men might lead one to expect more of a struggle between church and state than was proved to exist. To facilitate reading of the text the writer might have, by the expediency of a footnote, used one system of chronology instead of two throughout.

However, these suggested improvements do not materially affect the value of this study. The style is clear and direct. The table of contents is analytical.

The bibliography is critical. The citations, judging by the several samples which were verified, are trustworthy. The writer's contribution, it appears, is that she has made available a concise, lucid, and accurate account of the status of religion in Georgia prior to 1800.

Clemson College

R. CASPER WALKER

*Eighteenth Century North Carolina Imprints, 1749-1800.* By Douglas C. McMurtrie. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. vii, 198. Illustrations. \$4.00.)

The discovery, identification, and compilation of early American imprints are notably associated today with the name of Douglas Crawford McMurtrie. Moreover, to countless historians, librarians, and scholars in many fields Mr. McMurtrie is not only a name but a stimulating personality who in his wide travels and engaging lectures has generated a far-reaching interest in his subject. The present volume on North Carolina imprints is a worthy addition to the steadily growing list under his name.

North Carolina is indebted primarily to Stephen B. Weeks for studies of the early press and for his own collection of imprints which was acquired by the state University after his death. This fact and the collecting activity of the University in more recent years doubtless explain why the number of these imprints at Chapel Hill is second only to that in the Library of Congress. Mr. McMurtrie, who pays his respects to Weeks, has ranged far afield in his quest for hitherto unknown titles. He has been well repaid for his search in the British Public Record Office, for he has antedated Weeks' earliest imprint (1751) by two years. Thirty-eight issues of early laws, legislative journals, and certain Revolutionary documents have been found only in this repository. Weeks listed sixty-three unlocated titles, of which McMurtrie has found thirty-nine. Weeks' seventy-six located titles have been more than tripled by McMurtrie.

Most of the colonial and Revolutionary imprints consist of official documents. In fact, it was for the express purpose of printing the laws of the colony that James Davis, first printer of North Carolina, was encouraged to set up his press in New Bern in 1749. In spite of diligent search, some laws and numerous legislative journals of the colonial and early statehood years, which are known to have been printed, are still unlocated. The first religious imprint is listed under the date 1753; Weeks had also recorded it, but as yet no copy has been located. The first political pamphlet is listed for 1765 and concerns the Stamp Act. The fact that many of these pre-Revolutionary political imprints have survived only as single copies in the Public Record Office suggests both the concern which the royal government felt regarding colonial opposition and the ephemeral nature of such pamphlets, assuring their rapid disappearance after they had served their immediate purpose. For the 1790's one finds a wider variety

of subjects represented by the imprints. Newspaper titles were excluded by the compiler, no doubt because of Dr. Brigham's authoritative list of early American newspapers, published by the American Antiquarian Society.

The spread of printing in North Carolina is shown by a geographical list of printers with the number of titles ascribed to each during the period, 1749-1800. The book also includes a list of "doubtful titles," a general index, and a place-name index. The typography is by Mr. McMurtrie and Ragner H. Johnson, and the printing maintains the high caliber of craftsmanship which the University of North Carolina Press has always insisted upon.

University of Virginia

LESTER J. CAPPON

*The Life and Times of Edmund Pendleton.* By Robert Leroy Hilldrup. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. xi, 363. Bibliography, illustrations. \$3.50.)

The past three years have witnessed the publication of biographies of varied caliber like Robert K. Brock's *Archibald Cary of Amphill: Wheelhorse of the Revolution*; Mary Haldane Coleman's *St. George Tucker: Citizen of No Mean City*; Helen Hill's *George Mason: Constitutionalist*; and Abbot Emerson Smith's *James Madison: Builder*. To these studies in the field of Virginia's eighteenth century development has now been creditably added the first available *Life of Edmund Pendleton* (1721-1803), whose leadership in such local capacities as chairman of the colonial Committee of Safety, first president of the state's Supreme Court of Appeals, and president of the Constitutional Convention of 1788, has been too long appraised only indirectly.

This narrative of an undeniably influential career extending through five decades, from the *pistole* fee controversy to the belated confiscation of glebe lands, touches with a distinct reference value upon parliamentary taxation, western land speculation, Revolutionary diplomacy and military history, Virginia's first and the Union's two constitutions, and many other aspects of the epoch. But, aside from previously unearthed Pendleton manuscripts, specialists will find little in the nature of either fact or interpretation which is new. The volume was evidently not intended to be definitive, as one might casually infer from its title. Its picture of the times in which Pendleton lived are sketched only as a setting for its portrait of him.

Although there have been scholars who dismissed Pendleton as an outright conservative, few readers of this thoughtful biography will quarrel with its portrayal of him as a "moderate, practical leader in an age of great and uncertain transitions," or will deny that it has largely achieved its announced attempt "to show that the American Revolution was not quite so radical as some might wish to believe, and that the adoption of the Federal Constitution was not entirely the work of a reactionary group." The distinction between moderation and con-

servatism is usually clear, though possibly less convincingly so in the instance of Pendleton's objections to the liberal Jeffersonian program of separation of church and state and elimination of entailed land tenure than in other cases.

A principal merit of the book lies in the fact that the author has not resorted to the dubious biographical technique of exalting Pendleton by disparaging his adversaries or their viewpoints; Patrick Henry, for example, is treated with neither vindictiveness nor condescension. And it should also be pointed out that there is a solid worth in the author's careful paraphrases (an odious word here used in no critical sense) of unpublished letters written by and to Pendleton after 1775. These do much to relieve a virtually inevitable tedium in the earlier chapters, for which impersonal, official legislative records were necessarily the author's major reliance. It might be argued that this value of the work would have been enhanced if Pendleton had been given more frequent opportunities to speak for himself, but there is an obvious refutation of this point.

The volume represents able presswork and painstaking authorship. This reviewer noted as relatively inconsequential defects only one typographical error, several inconsistencies in footnote citations, and a few lacunae in the serviceable index. The bibliography is exhaustive in regard to Pendleton materials and adequate for its purpose in respect to his era as a whole. The author deserves more than faint praise.

Mary Washington College

W. EDWIN HEMPHILL

*Sectionalism and Internal Improvements in Tennessee, 1796-1845.* By Stanley John Folmsbee. (Knoxville: East Tennessee Historical Society, 1939. Pp. vi, 293. Bibliography, map. \$3.75.)

Sectionalism in Tennessee was due chiefly to inequalities in transportation facilities, and internal improvements the result of sectional compromise. Professor Folmsbee has therefore been able to combine in one story a fairly complete history of both. It was East Tennessee, poor and without access to markets, which after a brief flirtation with the idea of Federal aid became the insistent advocate of internal improvements at the expense of the state; Middle Tennessee, prosperous and with a navigable Cumberland, consistently opposed. The battling sections fought each other to a standstill and it was only in 1830 that an agreement could be reached on an allocation of the scant revenues which Tennessee, as a landless state, was able to appropriate. In that year the legislature allocated to each of the three sections a small sum which East Tennessee expended on the Tennessee River, and the other two sections dissipated on local projects. Meanwhile, there was sweeping over East and West Tennessee a railroad fever which failed to affect the middle section. Middle Tennessee wanted turnpikes, and after a prolonged period of lusty altercation a compromise was

arranged by which the state was to subscribe to the stock of all railroad and turnpike companies in Tennessee. This law, passed in 1836 and strengthened in 1838, was repealed in 1840. Only Middle Tennessee profited by the law securing its turnpikes while East Tennessee sported with the mirage of the Louisville, Cincinnati and Charleston, and the Hiwassee Railroad, and West Tennessee dropped its revenues into the bottomless pit of the Memphis and La Grange. The net result of the state-aid experiment was a good system of turnpikes in Middle Tennessee, an entire absence of roads and railroads in the other two sections, a state debt of nearly two million dollars, and a tremendous acceleration of sectional illwill.

This book is strong meat for men. Neither sectionalism nor internal improvements is a fit subject for a Christmas carol and the history of the two combined does not make suitable reading for the deckchair or the seashore. But the author has told the story clearly and simply and has shown remarkable talent in interlarding the necessary statistics in such a way as actually to increase the interest. His bibliography shows that he has consulted all pertinent sources. The result is a book of formidable scholarship and assured permanence.

Florida State College for Women

R. S. COTTERILL

*Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana: A Social History of White Farmers and Laborers during Slavery and After, 1840-1875.* By Roger W. Shugg. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1939. Pp. x, 372. Appendix, bibliography. \$3.50.)

The author is primarily concerned with the lower social and economic class in Louisiana before the Civil War. He makes an excellent analysis of the physiographic divisions in Louisiana; and he quite logically follows this up with an analysis of the several social and economic classes which he thinks were segregated somewhat according to regions. At the top of the social and economic scale he finds the great planter possessing alluvial areas and dominating the life of the state; in the prairies and oak uplands the author locates the middle-class planter and the yeoman, both of whom were small slaveholders. At the bottom of the social classes were the poor farmer and laborer.

In his examination of the nonslaveholding farmer, the author draws little distinction between the landed and the landless; nor does he draw any distinction between the skilled artisan, who not infrequently owned considerable property, and the river roustabout. On the contrary, he seems to think of them all as proletarians. When it may be pointed out, however, that in the lower southern states as a whole between 60 and 70 per cent of the nonslaveholding agricultural population were owners of their farms, and that, of this land-owning group, about 80 per cent held up to two hundred acres of land and 20 per cent above two hundred, it will be readily seen that the bulk of the non-

slaveholders were not proletarians. But the looseness of a generalization that lumps all nonslaveholders as proletarians is not fully apparent until the author's tables on farm tenure are checked against the unpublished census records (microfilms of which the reviewer has in his possession). Mr. Shugg assumes that the nonslaveholding farmer in the Louisiana black belt did not as a rule own his land. With inadequate statistical information he reaches this conclusion. The figures that he gives for the black belt parishes make an average of 54 per cent of landless farmers. In the parish of Iberville he lists 484 landless farmers out of 760 families—that is, 63 per cent; but on checking the unpublished census population schedule that gives the vocations of all people above twenty-one as well as the value of their real and personal property the reviewer found that only about 30 rather than 484 did not own their land. In other words, about 11 per cent of the agricultural population rather than 63 per cent were landless. Mr. Shugg's error lies in his assumption that all families in the rural parish of Iberville were engaged in agriculture, that is, as has been stated, he assumes that 760 families were engaged in farming and planting. Actually the census gives less than 300. Practically all of Mr. Shugg's 484 landless farmers were not farmers at all, but had many different vocations: literally here were the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, rich man, poor man, beggar man, thief, doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief—everything but farmer. The rural parish of Iberville was not so simple in its social structure as the author assumes in his tables. The same type of error characterizes all of his statistics on farm tenure.

Contrary, then, to Mr. Shugg's conclusions, most of the agricultural families in the black belt of Louisiana, whether slaveholders or nonslaveholders, were landowners. As the author points out, 50 per cent or more of the white population in the black belt were nonslaveholders; and the majority of slaveholders—a fact that he does not take note of—were small planters and farmers, thus giving predominance of number in the black belt to those classes ranging from moderately wealthy to moderately poor. In the end, however, one does come to a very small fraction of the population who seem to have been genuine proletarians. This small group existed in both country and town in upcountry and black belt, but it was more numerous in the urban centers. Whether it was class conscious or not, it seems to have been too unimportant in size to create a ripple upon the surface of an essentially property owning society.

One would certainly not say that Mr. Shugg has consciously made Procrustean use of his data in order that it might fit the Marxian bed; but one cannot avoid the feeling that the author—despite a book excellent in many respects—has permitted his Marxian assumption to make him less alert in discovering or using data that would not conform to the theory of the class struggle.

*Political Nativism in Tennessee to 1860.* By Sister Mary de Lourdes Gohmann. (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1938. Pp. vii, 192. Bibliography, appendices. \$2.00.)

It is encouraging to students of American political history that in the last few years have appeared several regional or state studies of nativism in the 1850's and the Know-Nothing party. Such an eclectic and heterogeneous party becomes intelligible only by such an approach. Unfortunately, however, Sister Gohmann's *Political Nativism in Tennessee to 1860* falls far short of living up to the promise of its title.

It will save the energy of both reviewer and reader if it is stated frankly at the outset that this book, because of its superficiality, resembles a college term paper rather than a doctoral dissertation. Overlooking such matters as a constant incorrect use of the comma and frequent lengthy quotations from poor and often irrelevant secondary works, one's unavoidable impression is that the author fails throughout to get beneath the surface of her subject or to give significance to a series of political events.

This study is divided into two parts: the historical background of Tennessee politics prior to 1850, and the elections of 1855 (gubernatorial) and 1856 (presidential) in Tennessee, in which nativism was apparently the issue. In the first, though the author cites Abernethy's *From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee* and even quotes a page from it, one looks in vain for any other indication that she has read that penetrating study. Any comprehension of social and economic influences on Tennessee politics is lacking. Certainly no one familiar with the composition of the Whig party in that state could write: "a most potent factor . . . which played its part in social and political life was the rising bourgeoisie, who had little sympathy with the planter class." It may not have been due to sympathy, but the salient fact is that this bourgeoisie united with their planter neighbors and formed the Whig party to protect their mutual interests against the yeoman farmers of Tennessee.

The first half of the book establishes the fact that there were few foreigners and fewer Catholics in the state. Obviously, then, its nativism was a rarified form of the genuine article. That only in Memphis, where resided 90 per cent of the state's foreign-born, was there any genuine nativism of the Massachusetts variety, the author fails to mention. In her chapters on the crucial elections, that of 1855 which the Know-Nothings barely lost to Andrew Johnson and that of 1856 which Buchanan carried by a majority of over 7,000, she gets lost in the various persons involved, particularly in Parson Brownlow. Not until almost the last sentence of fifty pages of discussion does the reader learn, to his surprise, that the Democrats won their first presidential victory in Tennessee since 1832 because "the issue in the state as in the rest of the South was the abolition of slavery."

Such comment could be repeated *ad nauseam*. The final evidence of lack of

objectivity and a fair sample, I think, of the general tone of this book is its concluding paragraph:

"The American people at large or in Tennessee did not make war on the Catholic Church, but merely a party of religious fanatics and unprincipled demagogues who as little represented the American people as did the mobs whom they incited to bloodshed and incendiarism. Such conduct was un-American, despite the patronymic. Our revered president and statesman of the twentieth century defined real patriots:

" 'The stoutest and truest Americans are the very men who have the least sympathy with the people who invoke the spirit of Americanism to aid what is vicious in our government, or to throw obstacles in the way of those who strive to reform it.' "

Yale University

GERALD M. CAPERS, JR.

*The Cotton Kingdom in Alabama.* By Charles S. Davis. (Montgomery: Alabama State Department of Archives and History, 1939. Pp. xi, 233. Bibliography, appendices, maps, and charts. \$2.50.)

The book under review is a welcomed addition to the growing list of accounts of ante-bellum plantation life in specific southern states. As an introduction it contains a description of Alabama's topography and settlement. Then follow discussions of the management of plantations, owner-slave and -overseer relations, the legal position of slaves, shipment and sale of cotton, and conclusions concerning the profitability of cotton production. Of particular interest to students of southern history is the discussion of the legal attitude of the state toward slavery. Paternalism reigned in Alabama as elsewhere in the South before 1861, and planters and the state legislature enacted stringent rules and laws in regard to conduct of slaves only after it seemed that the institution was being attacked.

The most significant contribution of the book is its treatment of the factorage system in Alabama. When planters first moved into the region (in the second decade of the nineteenth century, because of failure in the Upper South) they were either accompanied by old factors or soon made the acquaintance of new ones. The system became firmly established with the coming of the planters into the river valleys and the black belt, and as the Cotton Kingdom spread the factorage system became more and more elaborate. Planters needed almost unlimited credit if they were to operate and, since the state did not offer an adequate banking system, they dealt primarily through factors. It was during the pre-Civil War period that these agents established their permanent and almost complete control of the destiny of Alabama planters. The state's factors were among the most active in the South. Most of the cotton produced was shipped through Mobile, although much of that made in the northern section

found its way to New Orleans and Charleston. River traffic of course predominated. Shipments from Mobile increased from 7,000 bales in 1817 to about 800,000 bales in 1860, and all except a few thousand bales passed through the hands of factors. The mere presence of factors indicates that planters were always in debt. Moreover, Alabama planters as a whole did not attempt conscientiously to produce food and other plantation supplies. The purchase of these supplies and of land, slaves, clothes, implements, household goods, and medicines meant an ever-increasing debt, which could not be paid because of the instability of the cotton market. Consequently, in most cases the Alabama planter "before he died . . . was in actuality working for his factor as a result of the accumulated obligations" (p. 183).

An account of plantation economics in ante-bellum Alabama has long been needed. Professor Davis' study indicates a prodigious labor on his subject, and on the whole he has done an admirable piece of work. It is to be regretted, however, that so little attention was given to methods of operation on small and medium-sized plantations. But, the author makes no pretense of having written a definitive account of slavery and plantation life in Alabama. A study of the state, comparable to those already published on Mississippi and Georgia, is still to be made.

Judson College

WEYMOUTH T. JORDAN

*Romance of Beginnings of Some Alabama Industries; An American Pilgrimage Address.* By Peter A. Brannon. (Birmingham: Birmingham Publishing Company, 1939. Pp. 84. Illustrations.)

The title states "Some Alabama Industries," but this delightful little volume runs the gantlet of Alabama industries from Sequoyah's Cherokee Indian alphabet to blast furnaces. Written as an address and delivered before the American Branch of the Newcomen Society of England on the occasion of its 1939 pilgrimage at Mobile, this study has the faults common to many papers in that it consists of information on many subjects digested and skeletonized to almost statistical form. The beginnings of practically every type of industry in the state—lumber, coal, iron, ceramics, textiles, transportation, and a host of others—flit by in endless fashion. As the title indicates, only the pertinent facts of the beginnings are given, with little or no attempt to trace or interpret later developments. Despite its brevity of treatment, the work is very interesting and informative. A number of illustrations add to its value.

The material seems to have been drawn chiefly from contemporary primary sources; the paucity of footnote citations, however, lessens the value of the volume to the research student of Alabama social history. There is no table of contents, bibliography, or index.

Historical Records Survey

V. L. BEDSOLE

*John McDonogh, His Life and Work.* By William Talbott Childs. (Baltimore: Meyer and Thalheimer, 1939. Pp. xi, 255. Bibliography, illustrations. \$2.00.)

John McDonogh was one of the most interesting characters in the history of American business. The lack of a good biography of him has been one of the most appalling gaps in our national hagiology. Historians, therefore, would be happy to learn that a first-rate work on McDonogh was available to them, but this happiness is still denied in spite of the recent publication by Mr. William Talbott Childs.

Mr. Childs is a graduate and retired headmaster of McDonogh School which was founded near Baltimore by John McDonogh's money. His interest in McDonogh is, therefore, natural and commendable and he should have had access to all available sources of information on the curious old philanthropist who was his benefactor.

Unfortunately, however, Mr. Child's book is only, according to his own foreword, a "compilation and rearrangement" of what is already known about McDonogh. He apparently has not investigated the thousands of McDonogh papers in the Tulane University Library or the very nice, but smaller, collection at Duke University. What he does include in his work comes mainly from the few already well-known pamphlets, and essays in periodicals, on McDonogh. Furthermore, the book is without documentation and there is no indication of which quotations in the book have appeared before in print and which have not. It is unhappily clear, therefore, that the book is of little use to historians and adds practically nothing to the too little already known about its subject.

In addition to the above deficiencies of scholarship there should be added some comment on very doubtful interpretations included in the book. Mr. Childs states unequivocally that McDonogh was of sound mind. This may be seriously doubted in the case of any man who honestly believed himself to be a chosen steward of God for the accumulation of vast wealth. McDonogh's will itself shows fairly conclusive evidence of having been produced by a mind in no sense normal. This is especially notable in the assumption that his property would eternally enhance in value and would provide enough money for the education of children throughout North America. Not even in Mr. Hoover's New Era was such optimism as this displayed by our prophetic men of business.

It seems to me also that the whole point of McDonogh's scheme for the emancipation of slaves has once again been missed. From McDonogh's own statement of this complicated plan it is almost certain that what he had primarily in mind was increased productivity of slave labor. In any case the plan offered no hope for the solution of the slave problem because of its utter impracticability under ordinary plantation circumstances. It was successful in the case of McDonogh's slaves only because of several highly exceptional circumstances of

which the most important was that his slaves were not engaged primarily in ordinary agricultural work but in brickmaking, construction, and similar activities. Also he lived in the kind of association with his slaves that no other Southerner could have stomached and this resulted in a sort of intimacy which enabled him to exercise influence far beyond that possible to most slaveowners. Finally, the success of the whole venture depended upon a level of learning in his slaves which was not only far beyond that of the average but was also an open violation of the law.

Further points such as the above might be mentioned but space will be taken only to add that had Mr. Childs looked at the McDonogh letters in the Tulane University Library he would have suspected very strongly that some of the slaves which McDonogh so kindly "liberated" in Africa were his own children. In any case that has seemed to several competent scholars the only possible explanation of several passages in letters to McDonogh from his former slaves in Liberia.

It is with regret that your reviewer must conclude that the final word on McDonogh has not yet been said and the history profession has not been greatly benefited by Mr. Childs' book.

Georgia State College for Women

MACK SWEARINGEN

*The Secession Movement in North Carolina.* By Joseph Carlyle Sitterson. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. vii, 285. Bibliography, maps. \$3.00.)

The literature on secession continues to grow. In recent years extensive studies of the secession movement in individual states have appeared. There are still several states which should be treated; and when they are, Professor Sitterson's able study of North Carolina should in many respects serve as a model. It is exhaustive, in the main accurate, and free of prejudice.

As a background for his study, the author analyzes the social and economic forces that bound North Carolina to the North and South, respectively, and that partially explained the sectionalism within the state. After summarizing briefly the development of state rights from 1787 to 1847, he traces with much care from a wealth of sources North Carolina's opposition to the Wilmot Proviso, support of the Compromise of 1850, and indifference to Calhoun's movement for southern unity which resulted in the Nashville Convention. An excellent chapter follows on the forces and arguments which caused the leaders to become hostile to the North and to question the wisdom and desirability of permanent association with the free states. The state's reaction to the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the Brooks-Sumner incident, the Dred Scott decision, and the Kansas controversy are treated briefly but adequately. He emphasizes the importance of Helper's *Impending Crisis*, the continued growth of antislavery

sentiment, John Brown's raid, the split in the Democratic party, and the election of Lincoln as factors in convincing many that the Republicans would soon gain the support of the whole North, and thereby establish hostile control at Washington. Nevertheless, as Mr. Sitterson reveals, the mass of the people remained loyal to the Union as was illustrated by their defeat in February, 1861, of a state convention and by the election of Union delegates to that convention. Finally, he points out the fact that the failure of compromise at Washington, the firing on Sumter, and Lincoln's call for troops convinced North Carolinians that the division of the Union was final and that, therefore, the issue ceased to be a matter of loyalty to the old Union, but a choice between the North and the South. Even in May one third of the delegates to the new state convention supported the right of revolution as a means of withdrawing from the Union.

Professor Sitterson's story is well organized and treated in a straightforward manner. His conclusions are based on ample evidence. He sticks closely to his theme, sometimes, possibly, to the extent of failing to fit his story into the national setting of which it was a part. He has digested his material, although he is sometimes timid in his conclusions. His bibliography is critical and fairly complete. In fact, one wonders why he includes some personal collections which were, as he says, "of no help for this study." There are no manuscripts or newspapers listed from depositories outside North Carolina, although he cites several photostatic copies of collections in the Library of Congress.

There are a few minor inaccuracies or typographical errors, such as the misspelling of Yancey (p. 40, n. 9) and the use of 36° 31' for 36° 30' (p. 29). There are also some inconsistencies in the form of the footnotes, as the abbreviation and capitalization of "chapter" (p. 164, n. 83; p. 168, n. 105; p. 196, n. 87; p. 202, n. 122) and the use of and failure to use "*ibid.*" (p. 42, n. 16; p. 50, n. 52; p. 52, n. 66; p. 76, n. 19; p. 84, n. 62). Despite these technical inconsistencies in the form of the footnotes, it is an excellent study. It includes a satisfactory index and three good maps.

Birmingham-Southern College

HENRY T. SHANKS

*Joseph E. Brown and the Confederacy.* By Louise Biles Hill. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. viii, 360. Bibliography. \$3.50.)

This interesting study appears to have one essential purpose: to tell the story of the controversies between Georgia's Civil War Governor and the Confederate administration, and to show that these disagreements were partially responsible for the collapse of the Confederacy. The writer traces the rise of an obscure North Georgia judge to the governor's chair in 1857, deals briefly with his administration of state affairs, and then treats more exhaustively the almost endless bickerings with President Davis and his Secretaries of War. Two

chapters on Governor Brown's postwar career complete the study, and mark the end of a politician whose good qualities seem to have been interred with his bones.

Dr. Hill's work, which received the Mrs. Simon Baruch prize offered by the United Daughters of the Confederacy, has many excellences. It is the result of a considerable amount of research and reflective thought. A large mass of material has been ably digested into a clear, well-written monograph. So far as it deals with the bare facts of Brown's opposition to the Confederate administration, it makes a distinct contribution to the history of the Civil War. The suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, the conscription acts, the impressment of supplies, the officering of state militia in Confederate service, the blockade-running policy of the Richmond administration, military defeats in Georgia—all these aroused Brown's ire and kept him so constantly embroiled with Confederate authorities that men who knew him well feared he was a traitor to the cause. This feeling became especially strong when Brown and the Stephens brothers were leading the Georgia peace movement.

One lays down the book with the thought that Brown was, indeed, a troublesome, faultfinding character who certainly weakened the strength of Confederate arms. But other thoughts soon arise. Has not Dr. Hill peered too closely at the Confederate side of these controversies, and thus missed any justification which might have supported Brown's activities? Certainly there is a pronounced tendency to sympathize with Davis and to frown darkly upon the Governor's criticisms. Admitting Brown's almost constant opposition to the Richmond administration, why did not the Georgia patriots cut him down in the election of 1863? The author raises this question, but she does not satisfactorily answer it. A closer study of that election from newspaper sources might have provided clues. Perhaps the voters themselves disliked Confederate policies which Brown attacked. This fact, for example, goes far toward explaining the re-election of Zebulon B. Vance, North Carolina's Civil War Governor, who involved himself in numerous quarrels with Jefferson Davis. The reader may well wonder, moreover, if Brown *acted* as much as he wrote and talked in opposition to the Confederate administration. Both Vance and Brown were politicians who came down from the hills; each, when he sat down to write a letter, was inclined to make a stump speech. A list of Brown's threats against the Richmond administration, compared with what he actually did, might be very revealing. Any study of these controversies, furthermore, is incomplete and ill-balanced unless it lays some stress upon Davis' poor health, his extreme pettiness under certain circumstances, and his almost pathological sensitiveness to criticism.

Through Dr. Hill's pages the argumentative Governor walks with quick and nervous strides; yet he does not really live. Although we can read his letters and hear the echoes of his blows at Davis, there is an aura of unreality about him. The man does not stand forth; he is enveloped in shadows which Dr.

Hill has not penetrated. But this is by no means the author's fault. As Dr. Owsley indicates in the foreword, "she was greatly impeded in her study of Brown by a lack of documentary material of a private and personal nature."

At least a few words should be written about Chapter X, entitled "The Fall of the Confederacy." This chapter includes an analysis of Brown's motives and a discussion of state rights in the Confederacy that go far toward explaining the enigmatic Governor's actions. Though we are still somewhat in the dark, this ably written chapter has thrown brilliant patches of light upon the subject.

Hendrix College

RICHARD E. YATES

*The Road to Richmond: The Civil War Memoirs of Major Abner R. Small of the Sixteenth Maine Volunteers. Together with the Diary which he kept when he was a Prisoner of War.* Edited by Harold Adams Small. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939. Pp. xiii, 314. Bibliography, illustrations. \$3.50.)

This interesting book contains the Civil War memoirs of Major Abner R. Small of the Sixteenth Maine Volunteers and his diary while confined in Confederate military prisons from the middle of August, 1864, to the end of February, 1865. In describing his experiences with the Army of the Potomac from the early days of the war and later as a prisoner, Major Small displays fine powers of observation, a good touch of humor, and a philosophical attitude unusual in a soldier. Although his recollections are largely concerned with the vicissitudes of the Sixteenth Regiment, some remarks are of more general interest. He infers that much of the suffering of northern troops in Libby, Salisbury, and Danville prisons could have been prevented if the authorities had provided better accommodations. As a possible further indictment of these places and as a commentary on conditions in the South, he reveals that prisoners who had money could obtain food to supplement their meager fare. Now and then the author comments on civilian affairs in the South, such as the condition of the railroads and the hardships endured by noncombatants in the battle areas.

Fortunately for the student of military history, the Sixteenth Maine Regiment took part in phases of several major battles about which information is scarce. For example, Major Small writes of the part his regiment played at Fredericksburg in operations against the Confederate right, where the Union forces were more successful than anywhere else along the line. His description helps to balance other accounts of the battle which tend to overemphasize the futile attempts of the Federals to storm Marye's Heights. At Chancellorsville the Sixteenth Maine, as part of Reynold's Corps, reached the extreme Union right after Jackson had made his famous right flanking attack on Howard's Corps. In recording the movements of the Sixteenth from that time until Hooker retreated north of the Rappahannock, and the episode of his own reconnaissance

of Confederate lines, Major Small has partially filled in a gap in the history of activity on the Union right. According to his version of the battle of Gettysburg, the Sixteenth Maine was one of several Federal army units which failed to receive just honors. He has also corrected the official reports of the movements of certain Union divisions in cutting the Weldon Railroad; a minor point, to be sure, but an interesting one.

The book has certain limitations. For instance, Major Small makes allusions to various events which would be unintelligible to the average reader but for the editor's excellent notes. Furthermore, he fails to present the war in broad perspective, a natural consequence of his position as a subordinate regimental officer. In spite of its shortcomings, however, the work through its intimacy with neglected details gives a sense of reality which is often lacking in other accounts of the Civil War.

Teachers College of Connecticut

EDWIN B. CODDINGTON.

*The Life of Braxton Craven: A Biographical Approach to Social Science.* By Jerome Dowd. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1939. Pp. xvi, 246. Frontispiece. \$3.00.)

One day in 1841 there appeared upon the grounds of a struggling local academy in the backwoods village of Trinity, North Carolina, a footsore youth of nineteen. A mere boy in years but a man in dignity, poise, and mentality, he had come, mostly on foot, from New Garden Academy (now Guilford College) where he had been studying for two years—almost his only formal schooling. Yet he was about to enter a long and distinguished career, first as a teacher in the little Trinity Academy, and later as president of the same institution transformed into Trinity College, destined to become Duke University.

How Braxton Craven, beset with such obstacles and difficulties as he encountered, became the scholar, the teacher, the builder, the leader and "maker of men" that he did is indeed a fruitful field for the "biographical approach to social science"—whatever the value of that approach. He was deserted by his father when he was only four years old; was supported in poverty, along with two younger sisters, by the menial toil of his mother until she died when he was seven; was apprenticed to a farmer who overworked him at tasks beyond his years until he went on his own as a rural teacher at fifteen. With precious little schooling, obtained in a local "field school" in the years of his apprenticeship, he had burned the midnight lightwood knots. And he continued to burn them until he could afford kerosene lamps. But with all his toil and study, it seems that he did not neglect human contacts. He made hosts of warm friends, handling human problems with tact and poise; he also made enemies, what with his dynamic personality and the bitter squabbles in educational and religious as well as other circles in his day, but these he overcame, it seems, always without guile or venom.

Professor Dowd, who was a student under Dr. Craven, published a brief biography of him in 1896 (131 pages of biography and 112 pages of extracts from his speeches, sermons, and writings). The present edition is an expansion of the biography proper. It is fuller, richer, and more interesting. Whether it is more scholarly may be questioned in some quarters. The author assumes that Dr. Craven was a product of his environment, with scarcely a reference to any possible hereditary influence. In substantiating his point he leans heavily on assumptions and inferences based on those assumptions. Even those (including the reviewer) who are inclined to weight the importance of environment very heavily may find it difficult or impossible to follow Professor Dowd all the way. Certainly many psychologists would challenge the assumption: "Modern psychology teaches that people are not born with *traits* and that whatever *general tendencies* they may display must be accounted for by association with one or more individuals who served as models" (p. 19, reviewer's italics).

Woman's College of the  
University of North Carolina

ALEX MATHEWS ARNETT

*The Tobacco Night Riders of Kentucky and Tennessee, 1905-1909.* By James O. Nall. (Louisville, Kentucky: The Standard Press, 1939. Pp. ix, 221. Illustrations, bibliography, appendices, maps. \$2.00.)

Kentucky has been the scene of many civil upheavals in the past seventy-five years of its existence. During this period there have been civil uprisings against the guerrilla bands of the Civil War, the Ku Klux Klan, the tollgate war of the nineties, the Goebel affair, the numerous family feuds, and the tobacco or "Black Patch War." Many of these uprisings stemmed from kindred sources. It has been extremely difficult at times to get at the facts in most of these outbreaks, either because they were not recorded and have been forgotten, or because persons living in the communities where the upheavals occurred are timid about describing the situation.

Dr. Nall has contributed a book which goes into complete detail of the tobacco war. He has practiced medicine for many years in western Kentucky, and he has been able to secure the information to piece together the complete story. He has avoided, as nearly as this reviewer can determine, the natural bias of public opinion in the region. Dr. Nall has been thoroughly honest and straightforward throughout his book.

The tobacco war was waged from 1905 to 1909. The scene of action was the southwesternmost counties of Kentucky, and the northwestern tier of counties in Tennessee. Hopkinsville, Dawson Springs, Princeton, Cadiz, Russellville, Trenton, Guthrie, and Pembroke in Kentucky and Paris, Dresden, Huntingdon, Waverly, and Clarksville in Tennessee were centers of activity.

Planters, exploited by the tobacco buyers, were poverty-stricken. They were

not receiving expenses for growing dark leaf tobacco. To them only one factor caused their trouble, and that was the unscrupulous buyer. To remedy the situation they organized, in 1904, the Dark Tobacco District Planters' Protective Association of Kentucky and Tennessee. It had for its purpose the assisting of members in grading and selling their tobacco. The organization of this association was the beginning of the night-rider movement. When the "hill billies" or independents refused to abide by the rules of the association they had their plant beds scraped, and if they then succeeded in growing a crop the cured product was destroyed either by burning the curing barns or the warehouses.

At Hopkinsville in the early morning of December 7, 1907, approximately four hundred night riders galloped into town and within two hours considerable shooting and carousing occurred, tobacco buyers were harassed, and the Tandy and Fairleigh factory was set afire. On January 3, 1908, Russellville was raided, and nearly \$80,000 worth of property was destroyed. Inevitably the night-rider movement got out of hand, and western Kentucky became a hotbed of rebellion. Governor J. C. W. Beckham, because of the treacherous political questions involved, failed to quell the riots. By 1909 they had run their course, and a fairly equitable system of marketing dark leaf tobacco was established. Dr. Nall has contributed a clear picture of what happened in this strange agricultural war. This is by far the best and most accurate account of the fantastic night riders and their fight for a living income from tobacco farming.

University of Kentucky

THOMAS D. CLARK

*The Negro Family in the United States.* By E. Franklin Frazier. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. Pp. xxxii, 686. Bibliography, illustrations, appendices. \$4.00.)

*The Negro Family in the United States* is much more than a book on the Negro family, much more than a book on the family in general. It is also a highly important contribution to the intimate history of the people of the United States and especially of the South.

When we read the political history of a country with its account of the stirring events and the daring heroes of the past we are led to feel, if not to say, "There were giants in those days!" We are tempted to regard such events and such heroes as having been produced by occult forces which we do not quite understand. But when we read a book like this one by Professor Frazier we are led to feel, if not to say, "There were people in those days, and they were very, very human." They were human even as we are human today, and they were moved to act by the same sort of motives and sentiments as move us.

For behind the formal and legal facts of American history, behind even the social and economic systems and conditions which characterized the various sections of this country at one time or another, have always stood the facts of

human nature. These are the sort of facts which, once grasped, make any situation intelligible and real because it then can be measured against the familiar experiences of everyday life in our own home communities. When we see the Colonial and Revolutionary periods and the Civil War and Reconstruction eras in terms of family life, that is, in terms of fathers, mothers, and children, then the past is indeed called up into the present and made to live again. There is more than a verbal tie between the words *family* and *familiar* and when the matters of the past are put in terms of the family the effect is to make them seem familiar and immediate.

All this is true when the account deals with the middle- and upper-class families who contributed most of the history-making personalities to American life, but it is even truer of those families farthest down who felt the storms and stresses of changing times with especial force and without the aid of an organizing and continuing tradition from their homeland. These were the Negro families.

Professor Frazier's book does much to break down the oversimplified black and white picture of southern society which too long has dominated our thinking. There has never existed in southern society a fixed and standardized set of racial relationships. Apparently on a frontier, as on an island, almost anything can happen and almost everything did happen in the relationships between whites, Negroes, and Indians on the southern frontier. The proud Anglo-Saxon was supposed to be averse to mixing his blood with inferior races but he did and under a wide variety of circumstances and with many curious and strange results. Not only were white men the fathers but white women were the mothers of numerous mixed-bloods. And not all mixed-bloods went unrecognized by their white fathers, mothers, half brothers, and half sisters. Often they visited each other in their homes, attended family reunions together, and maintained family relationships in other ways. Negroes passed over into the white world and even whites have passed over into the Negro world and identified themselves with Negro society. The chapter entitled "Racial Islands" is a particularly valuable contribution to a picture of southern society which varies considerably from the orthodox view.

The book as a whole is a study of the natural history of the Negro family in America. Because the slave trade ruthlessly destroyed African connections and upset the balance of the sexes, the Negro family had to be reformed under the difficult conditions of southern plantation life. It took form first as a "natural" family without the institutional supports and sanctions which even the most primitive savage societies have. Under the circumstances the female tended to be the dominant sex in slave family life since she was not dependent upon the father of her children for their support if he were a slave like herself. It did not matter if children were illegitimate since the master provided for all children alike. Indeed, where it was customary for the woman to do the sewing,

washing, and cooking for the family the slave father and husband was almost as dependent upon his wife as he was upon his master.

The tradition of female dominance in Negro families has been maintained even up to the present time to an extent which will be surprising to many readers. However, with the accumulation of property by the ante-bellum free Negro and by the post-bellum freed Negro there has been a tendency for the Negro family to reorganize under paternal dominance.

The urbanization of the Negro population since 1900 and especially since the first World War has brought the Negro into new and sharper forms of competition with whites and segregated him in the slums of northern and southern cities. This has ushered in a new period of demoralization and family disorganization.

It is quite likely that the 1940 census will show for the first time a larger Negro urban than rural population in the United States but it will take some time for American public opinion to realize that Negroes are no longer overwhelmingly peasant farmers. However, Negro reproductive rates in cities are far below replacement needs for, unlike groups such as the Jews and the Chinese, Negroes have not yet learned biologically how to live in the city. Nor is it likely that they soon will.

These considerations, when taken in conjunction with the author's conclusion that Negro families will continue to "crowd the slum areas of southern cities or make their way to northern cities where their family life will become disrupted and their poverty will force them to depend upon charity," indicate that the Negro family is facing a new testing time.

Some of the most valuable materials in the book are the selected family-history documents in the appendix.

Duke University

EDGAR T. THOMPSON

*The First Negro Medical Society: A History of the Medico-Chirurgical Society of the District of Columbia, 1884-1939.* By W. Montague Cobb. (Washington, D. C.: The Associated Publishers, 1939. Pp. x, 159. Appendices. \$2.10.)

One of the great gaps in the history of the Negro in America is an account of the social institutions. Something is known of the churches and schools; little else. So profoundly neglected has been this story that even in such an honest and liberal interpretation of the antislavery movement as has been recently supplied by Dwight L. Dumond, there is nowhere to be found any reference to the Negro conventions. These "national," regional, and state meetings were significant from the thirties through the fifties.

*The First Negro Medical Society* is a modest contribution to the literature on the growth of professional groups which occurred after the Civil War. Dr.

Cobb, who teaches anatomy at Howard University, traces the history of the organization, describes its functions, lists the publications, and summarizes the prospects for the future. There is an appendix and an index.

This medical combination owes its existence to a familiar pattern of relations: qualified Negroes were refused membership in the Medical Society of the District of Columbia. After a bitter fight which reached the floors of Congress, the Negro physicians retired and founded their own association. Though suffering the limitations of "Jim-Crow" institutions, the society has grown and is flourishing today.

Schomburg Collection, New York Public Library

L. D. REDDICK

*Carter Glass: A Biography.* By Rixey Smith and Norman Beasley. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1939. Pp. xv, 519. Appendix, illustrations. \$3.00.)

Biographies rarely appeal equally to the professional historian and to the general reader. Messrs. Rixey Smith and Norman Beasley have sacrificed the former for the latter. Carter Glass is portrayed not only sympathetically but eulogistically. When one learns that Mr. Smith for many years has been the private secretary of Senator Glass, the laudatory interpretation is easily explained.

Carter Glass was born in Lynchburg, Virginia, January 4, 1858. At thirteen the boy of necessity gave up school. Despite the lack of formal education, "he holds more degrees from American colleges and universities than any other member of Congress" (p. 424). At the age of twenty-two Glass was a reporter on the *Lynchburg News* and within a few years became editor and owner of the paper. As a member of the fourth estate he entered local politics. His political career has been one of advancement—from Lynchburg municipal politics to the state Senate in Richmond, and from Richmond to the national Congress.

As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, Glass fathered the Federal Reserve Act. When McAdoo resigned as secretary of the treasury in 1918, Wilson named Glass to the vacancy. Less than eighteen months later the Virginian left the cabinet to accept the senatorship which he still holds.

Despite America's change from an agricultural to an industrial economy, Glass still holds unreservedly to Jefferson's philosophy that those people who are best governed are least governed (p. 410). In open opposition to the present Democratic administration on many of its key measures, the Senator is ultra-conservative. Glass's opinions on earlier reforms such as the Hepburn Act, the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Mann-Elkins Act, the Clayton Anti-Trust law, the Seamen's Act, and the Adamson law are not given, nor are his views on the constitutional amendments which have been enacted since 1913 revealed. While Glass characterized one of the first appointees of the present administration to the Supreme Court as a "Charlie McCarthy" (p. 379), there is no

record of his appraisal of Holmes or Brandeis when they were named justices. The reader is deprived of any comparisons he may wish to make between Glass's attitude toward reform two decades ago and his attitude toward the New Deal.

The student of history regrets the meager use of the Senator's files, diary, and other primary source materials. No rules for the use of quotations are consistently followed despite the fact that many pages are devoted to excerpts from Glass's speeches. The reader has a difficult time deciding when Glass made his *first* speech in Congress. "He made no speech until his third term, when he had been in the House of Representatives five years and twenty-four days; then he spoke briefly in memory of John F. Rixey" (p. 62); "it was not until March 4, 1907, that the 'taciturn Gentleman' . . . projected himself and his opinions into legislative debate" (p. 67); "on May 27, 1908, Glass made the only speech against it [Vreeland-Aldrich Currency bill]. . . . It was his first speech before the House of Representatives" (p. 85); "Before the vote on the Federal Reserve Bill Glass was faced with the necessity . . . of making his first major speech on the floor of the House . . . September 10, 1913" (p. 125).

The authors have a tendency to use involved sentences. Two examples will suffice: "He tried his father's razor in the theory of stimulating growth by elimination, but stopped the operation on reaching a point near his chin, looking anxiously for cuts, found none, and kept on, touching lightly with the sharp open blade through to the end—to become panicky when the down didn't show up again for many days" (p. 19). "They [Glass's hobbies] were Jersey cattle, and molasses candy, the supply of which he replenished each day from a small shop that made it fresh every twenty-four hours" (p. 168).

The book is valuable because it paints an interesting portrait of one of the most courageous and original characters of our generation, but the definitive biography of Carter Glass is yet to be written.

Berry College

GEORGE C. OSBORN

## COMMUNICATIONS

November 10, 1939

### THE MANAGING EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY:

Please allow me a little space in the *Journal* for a correction of a review. Professor A. B. Moore of the University of Alabama, in his discussion of *Forty Acres and Steel Mules* by H. C. Nixon, has fallen into error and has by that reason given an inaccurate impression of the book.

Professor Moore states that on page 50 Professor Nixon has mentioned an industrial expansion in the South between 1850 and 1860, but that the total volume of manufactured products in the South was less in 1860 than in 1850. Since no such subject matter appears anywhere on page 50 in the book it is

to be assumed that Professor Moore is referring to an incidental statement on page 10 which is the only reference in the book to this matter. It is true that the census reports a smaller volume of manufactured goods in the South in 1860 than in 1850, but the word "industrial" is broader than simple manufacturing, and if railroad building, mining, and similar activities are included, there can be no doubt that an industrial expansion did take place in the decade mentioned.

Without being tedious and attempting to correct all of the inaccurate impressions in Professor Moore's review, I nevertheless feel that I must ask your indulgence for the inclusion of two more. Professor Moore says, "Many persons go barefooted in summer, not because of poverty but for comfort," thus implying that Professor Nixon argued otherwise, whereas, Professor Nixon's own statement on page 13 was that he had seen white and colored people returning from church carrying their shoes to save their feet "from a pressure to which they were not accustomed."

Finally, Professor Moore also charges Professor Nixon with having failed to mention in the book that the exodus of people from the South was offset by inflow of outsiders into the South. Mr. Nixon's own sentence on this point can be found on page 10 as follows: "The census of 1930 showed a net export of more than three million population from the South." Professor Moore's attention is hereby called to the fact that the word "net" means the sum remaining after gains and losses have been balanced.

I do not have any desire whatsoever to deny to Professor Moore the right to dislike any book he wishes or to deny him the right to publish his opinions no matter how contrary to mine they may be. Any author who writes a book must be prepared to meet adverse criticism and I am positive that Professor Nixon would be the last to resent it. When, however, a reviewer constructs an adverse criticism on the basis of his own errors in fact, a public correction is almost obligatory.

M. SWEARINGEN

December 1, 1939

THE MANAGING EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY:

Thank you very much for sending me a copy of Professor Swearingen's protest of my review of Professor Nixon's *Forty Acres and Steel Mules*. Professor Swearingen did not favor me with a copy of his protest.

Professor Swearingen, a friend and former colleague of Professor Nixon, and according to the preface, having been consulted when the book was in process, is probably predisposed in favor of it. Some very competent students of southern history, in a position to take a more objective view, have expressed

approval of my review. One wrote, "It is excellent"; another, "It is good but too generous."

Professor Swearingen apparently ignored the favorable portions of my review when he concluded that it is "an adverse criticism." As regards my "errors," I am willing to leave that question to the judgment of impartial students of southern history who may care to read the book and my review of it. On reading again those portions of the book referred to by Professor Swearingen, I am convinced that my criticisms might have been, and probably should have been more severe.

Professor Nixon did not mention directly the inflow of outsiders into the South (p. 10) but it is implied, as Professor Swearingen has pointed out, in the phrase "net export of population." My impression was, and still is, that the discussion of the emigration of people from the South is presented in bad perspective. We need to consider more critically the cost to the South of the exodus of great numbers of its people, especially if they are to be regarded as a "surplus crop." In my judgment, Professor Nixon's brief discussion of the subject is misleading.

A. B. MOORE

## Historical News and Notices

The Southern Historical Association has rounded out its first five years with a most encouraging record. The annual report of the Secretary-Treasurer, printed elsewhere in this issue of the *Journal*, indicates steady growth in membership and marked financial stability. A total of 864 active members and a cash balance of \$6,117.67 within a five-year period are attainments unforeseen by even the most enthusiastic of the founding fathers. These figures in themselves constitute an eloquent valedictory to the efficient services of the retiring Secretary-Treasurer, Fletcher M. Green.

The following committee assignments have been announced by Frank L. Owsley, president of the Association. *Committee on program*: A. B. Moore, University of Alabama, chairman; Ella Lonn, Goucher College; Thomas S. Staples, Hendrix College; Robert D. Meade, Randolph-Macon Woman's College; John P. Dyer, Armstrong Junior College; and Ross H. McLean, Emory University. Professor McLean will be responsible for the European history portion of the program. *Committee on nominations*: William G. Bean, Washington and Lee University, chairman; E. Merton Coulter, University of Georgia; Thomas P. Abernethy, University of Virginia; Arthur Y. Lloyd, Department of Welfare, Frankfort, Kentucky; and A. W. Reynolds, Alabama Polytechnic Institute. *Committee on membership*: Hugh T. Lefler, University of North Carolina, chairman.

### PERSONAL

Weymouth T. Jordan of Judson College was adjudged the winner of the McClung Award for 1939. The award is a cash prize of \$50 given annually by Mrs. C. M. McClung of Knoxville to the contributor of the best article in each issue of the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications*. Dr. Jordan's contribution to *Publications* No. 11 is entitled "The Freedmen's Bureau in Tennessee." James G. Randall of the University of Illinois, James L. Sellers of the University of Nebraska, and Bell I. Wiley of the University of Mississippi were the judges.

On a grant from the Rosenwald Fund, which will run for three summers, Richard E. Yates of Hendrix College spent last summer in New York City working on an introductory course to the social sciences. He visited classes at

Columbia University and Teachers College, and did work in the libraries of those institutions.

A. R. Newsome of the University of North Carolina delivered the presidential address before the Society of American Archivists, meeting at Annapolis, Maryland, October 13-14. His subject was "The Archivist in American Scholarship."

David A. Lockmiller has been appointed acting head of the Department of History and Government at North Carolina State College.

On September 15 the President of the Maryland Historical Society announced the appointment of Raphael Semmes as librarian. Dr. Semmes received the doctorate in history from Johns Hopkins University, has taught at Trinity College in Connecticut, served as research professor at the University of Virginia, and has published two works on Maryland history: *Captains and Mariners of Early Maryland* (1937) and *Crime and Punishment in Early Maryland* (1938).

The Mayflower Cup for 1938-1939 was won by Mrs. Bernice Kelly Harris of Seaboard, North Carolina, for her novel, *Purslane*, a romance of rural Wake County in the early years of the present century. The competition, sponsored by the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina, is open to the original work of any resident North Carolinian, and covers the twelve months ending August 31. Mrs. Harris' work is a publication of the University of North Carolina Press.

### THE SOUTHERN PLANTER CENTENNIAL

The *Southern Planter*, "the oldest agricultural journal in America," is celebrating the hundredth anniversary of its founding in 1940. Featuring this centennial celebration, the *Planter* throughout the year will carry numerous articles discussing a hundred years of southern progress in various fields. The January issue will feature congratulatory letters from old friends, prominent agriculturists, educators, and statesmen. The leading article, entitled "Through The Years" and dealing with the editorial endeavors of the journal through June, 1861 (when it temporarily suspended publication on account of events connected with the War for Southern Independence), will be of interest to historians as it will emphasize the position of the *Planter* on the slavery issue.

Interested in the class of people that was struggling to restore "the exhausted fields of old Virginia," Charles Tyler Botts founded the *Southern Planter* in 1840. In the first issue (January, 1841) he stressed the democratic features of his paper. Dedicating it to the service of agriculture, horticulture, and the household arts, he planned to publish "an agricultural paper at so small a price, as to bring it within the reach of all." He hoped that the agriculturists of the South would "avail themselves of the opportunity to afford . . . to each

other, and to their brethren of the North, from whom they receive so much, the benefit of their experience."

At the time the journal was established, Virginia's first agricultural paper, the *Virginia Planter*, had long ceased to exist; while the *Farmers' Register*, published by Edmund Ruffin, by refusing to accept advertising, had kept its price beyond the reach of the ordinary man.

As Botts planned, so it was. In a day when there were no agricultural experiment stations and southern agricultural schools as we know them today, the *Planter* became the recognized source of the best ideas on agricultural methods and practices. In its columns practical farmers threshed out the questions of the day, leaving us an unimpeachable source of information on southern agricultural history. Articles from the pen of the illustrious Edmund Ruffin, reprints of discourses by John Taylor of Caroline, occasional letters from Solon Robinson, records of the Virginia State Agricultural Society, notes on the local "hole and corner clubs" and on the Grange in the South—these adorn its early pages.

Should any state or university libraries be interested in obtaining old volumes of the *Planter*, the editors of this journal will be glad to advertise freely among its readers in an effort to locate such volumes. Communications should be addressed to Louis C. Nolan, Associate Editor, Richmond, Virginia.

### HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The Southern Historical Association held a joint session with the American Historical Association at Washington on the morning of December 30. Charles S. Sydnor of Duke University served as chairman, and two papers, one on the Old South and the other on the New, were presented. "Southern Nationalism on the Eve of Secession: A Product of External or Internal Forces?" was discussed by Robert S. Cotterill of Florida State College for Women, and "The Genesis of the Nation's Problem in the South" was the subject of a paper by Paul H. Buck of Harvard University. Discussion of both papers was led by Benjamin B. Kendrick of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.

Among the other papers presented at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, two were of particular interest to students of southern history. "The Climatic Theory of the Plantation" was discussed by Edgar T. Thompson of Duke University at the luncheon conference of the Agricultural History Society, and Rupert B. Vance of the University of North Carolina read a paper on "The South's Development: The Population Factor" at a session devoted to population studies and history.

The State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina held its thirty-ninth annual meeting at Raleigh, December 7-8. The presidential address, "North Carolina's Ratification of the Federal Constitution," was delivered by

A. R. Newsome of the University of North Carolina. David A. Lockmiller of North Carolina State College reviewed "Fifty Years of North Carolina State College," Mrs. Hope S. Chamberlain of Chapel Hill spoke on the subject, "My First Chapel Hill Commencement," and Archibald Henderson of the University of North Carolina gave a review of 1939 North Carolina books. The session closed with an address, "The Eternal South," by John T. Graves, Jr., of the Birmingham *Age-Herald* editorial staff.

The North Carolina Society for the Preservation of Antiquities, chartered on October 4 and organized some two weeks later, held a meeting at Raleigh on December 7. The program included the following papers: "The Restoration of Tryon's Palace," by Miss Gertrude Carraway of New Bern; "Restoring the Ancient Town of Bath," by A. C. D. Noe of Bath; and "The Co-ordination of Objectives in Historical and Archaeological Work in North Carolina," by Harry T. Davis of Raleigh. The officers of the Society are: Joseph H. Pratt of Chapel Hill, president; James Boyd of Southern Pines, vice-president; and Mrs. C. A. Gosney of Raleigh, secretary-treasurer.

On December 9 the Archaeological Society of North Carolina convened in its seventh annual session at Raleigh. "Recent Developments in the Archaeology of Georgia" was the subject of an address by Robert Wauchope of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Georgia.

The Florida Historical Society held a joint meeting with the Palm Beach County Historical Society at Palm Beach, January 12-13. Among the papers presented were: "Challenge to Historical Critics," by Otto Eisenschiml, author of *Why Was Lincoln Murdered?*; "Human Landscaping of Old St. Augustine," by Mrs. E. W. Lawson, acting librarian of the St. Augustine Historical Society; "Aboriginal Life and Customs in Florida," by F. Hilton Crow of the National Park Service; "Plantations of the Halifax Area," by Mrs. A. F. Wilson of Ormond Beach; and "Moses Levy, Early 19th Century Pioneer (Father of Florida's First Senator)," by Leon Huhner of New York.

The annual banquet of the East Tennessee Historical Society was held at Knoxville on October 6, 1939. Gilbert Govan, librarian of the University of Chattanooga Library and book review editor of the *Chattanooga Times*, delivered an address on "The Solid South?"

#### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

The appearance of the first issue of *West Virginia History* (October, 1939) is indicative of historical activity and enterprise in another state south of Mason and Dixon's line. The new quarterly magazine is published by the State Department of Archives and History, Charleston, West Virginia, and it is "dedicated to the collection and preservation of material relative to the State and its people."

The editorial staff consists of Roy B. Cook, editor, and Innis C. Davis, managing editor. The inaugural number contains three meritorious articles: "James Rumsey, 'Ingenious Mechanic' and International Genius," by Matthew P. Andrews; "The Jones-Imboden Raid," by Festus P. Summers; and "The Kinnan Massacre," by Boyd B. Stutler. There are two documentary items: "A True Narrative of the Sufferings of Mary Kinnan," reprinted from the original; and "West Virginians in the American Revolution," assembled and edited by Ross B. Johnston. The issue also contains a book review section, "State History as Featured by the Press," and a list of publications of interest to West Virginians.

*Thomas Bray's Associates and Their Work among the Negroes* (Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1939, pp. 95), by Edgar L. Pennington, is a reprint from the Society's *Proceedings*, October, 1938. The study begins with a discussion of Dr. Bray and his philanthropic designs, and then considers in turn steps leading to the founding of Georgia, the work of the Associates in Georgia, Negro uplift in the Carolinas in the Colonial period, the church and the Negro in early Virginia, Negro work in colonial Maryland, the activities of the Associates in Pennsylvania, the church and the Negro in colonial New York, and the Associates' labors in New England.

*Faces We See* (Gastonia, N. C.: The Southern Combed Yarn Spinners Association, 1939, pp. 112, illustrations, \$3.00), by Mildred Gwin Barnwell, is mainly a pictorial account of a southern cotton mill village.

*A Bibliography of the Writings of Irving Bacheller* (Winter Park, Fla.: Rollins College *Bulletin*, Vol. XXXV, No. 1, September, 1939, pp. 48), by A. J. Hanna, contains also "Irving Bacheller: An Attempt at Interpretation," by Clarence H. Gaines. The bibliographical portion of the booklet lists twenty-eight novels, twenty-seven short stories, seventy-five essays and miscellaneous articles, fifteen poems and verses, two autobiographical works, and an edited volume of literature. Bacheller's "unusually versatile career as journalist, short story writer, essayist, poet, war correspondent, editor, and novelist accords him a high place in American letters and ranks him a dean of the literary colonists of Florida, in which state he has written approximately one half of his total number of books" (p. 6).

*John Freeman Young, Second Bishop of Florida* (Hartford, Conn.: Church Missions Publishing Company, Publication Nos. 195-96, May-October, 1939, pp. 63, 50 cents), by Edgar L. Pennington, tells the story of an Episcopal clergyman whose life spanned the period from 1820 to 1885. The study sketches briefly his education in the North and at the Alexandria (D. C.) Theological Seminary, his early ministrations in Florida, Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and New York, but the emphasis is upon his career as bishop of Florida, 1867-1885. There is also much information about the diocese of Florida.

*The Historical Records of North Carolina*, Vol. III (Raleigh: The North Carolina Historical Commission, pp. 760), edited by Christopher C. Crittenden and Dan Lacy, embraces *The County Records, Nash through Yancey*. This volume brings to a close the publication of inventories of North Carolina county records. As in preceding volumes of the series, the work was prepared by the Historical Records Survey.

Mimeographed inventories and transcriptions of county and other records, prepared by the Historical Records Survey, are becoming so voluminous that only a sampling may be listed here. Among those arriving at this office are the following: *American Imprints Inventory: Location Symbols for Libraries in the United States* (University, La.: Louisiana State University, 1939, pp. 258); *Transcriptions of Parish Records of Louisiana, No. 26, Jefferson Parish (Gretina)*, Ser. I, *Police Jury Minutes*, Vol. I, 1834-1843 (New Orleans: The Police Jury, Parish of Jefferson, 1939, pp. xxxvii, 346); *County-Parish Boundaries in Louisiana* (New Orleans: The Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, 1939, pp. 139); *Judicial and Congressional District Boundary Law in Louisiana* (New Orleans: The Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, 1939, pp. 90); *Directory of Libraries of Tennessee* (Nashville: The Historical Records Survey, 1939, pp. 17); *History and Organization of the Shelby County [Tenn.] Judiciary*, Serial Publications Series, No. 2 (Nashville: The Tennessee Historical Records Survey Project, 1939, pp. 14); *Inventory of the County Archives of Oklahoma, No. 5, Beckham County (Sayre)* (Oklahoma City: The Historical Records Survey, 1939, pp. 238); *A Manual for Field Workers of the Church Archives Inventory in Florida* (Jacksonville: The Historical Records Survey, 1939, pp. 41); *A Preliminary List of Religious Bodies in Florida* (Jacksonville: The Historical Records Survey, 1939, pp. 239); *Inventory of the County Archives of South Carolina, No. 4, Anderson County (Anderson)* (Columbia: The Historical Records Survey, 1939, pp. 147).

The Mississippi Valley Press of Oxford, Ohio, has recently been organized to publish volumes pertaining to cultural and political history. It is especially interested in giving scholars an opportunity to make significant contributions to Americana. *William Salter, Western Torchbearer*, by Philip D. Jordan, and *Thomas Riley Marshall, Hoosier Statesman*, by Charles H. Thomas, are the first volumes in the Men of America Series. "Heaven on Earth, A Planned Mormon Society," by J. W. McNiff, will appear in February as the first volume in the Annals of America Series.

A brief history and statement of policy of the Duke University Press, by R. O. Rivera, executive secretary, appeared in the *South Atlantic Bulletin*, October, 1939.

Among recent accessions to the Virginia State Library the following may be noted: the S. Bassett French Collection of biographical sketches of Virginians; *Orderly Book of Theodorick Bland*, January 20-August 20, 1777; *General George Weedon's Account Book*, 1784-1793; five papers pertaining to *Chimborazo Hospital*; *Account Books of a Lynchburg merchant*, 1826-1868; *Rockingham County Personal Property Books*, 1794, 1795, 1796; list of persons who took the Oath of Fidelity, Bedford County, 1777; *Diary*, 1861-1865, of Edwin Baker Loving, of Company I, First Regiment Virginia Infantry; *Quitrent Roll for Washington Parish, Westmoreland County*, 1777; *Elizabeth City County Record Book Number 10, Deeds, Wills, and Inventories*, 1721-1723; and *Confederate Commissary Books*.

The State Historical Society of Missouri has recently acquired approximately 209 unbound volumes of newspapers, 1906 to 1938, published in a score of counties in the southeastern part of the state. These were presented to the Society by the Southeast Missouri State Teachers College at Cape Girardeau.

A. J. Hanna of Rollins College, president of the Florida Historical Society, appointed early in 1939 a standing library committee to assist the Society's librarian in "the securing and conserving of important publications, documents, manuscripts, papers, letters, diaries and similar material to be housed in the . . . library, and in general to aid in the building of the collections of the Florida Historical Society." Projects for the year undertaken by the committee included the completion of the cataloguing of all collections in the Society's library, and the purchase of necessary library equipment.

The Society's library was established in 1902 by former Governor Francis P. Fleming of Jacksonville. Today it is one of the most valuable general collections on Florida, and includes among its manuscript collections the Governor Richard Keith Call Collection, Governor John Milton Collection, El Destino Plantation Records, Panton, Leslie & Company Papers, Territorial Florida Papers, 1823-1845 (miscellaneous), and Lieutenant John Pickell Journals. Recently an original letter signed by King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of Spain, dated August 12, 1492, and addressed to Don Juan de Ribera, Commander-in-Chief of the Army at the Frontiers of Navarre, was presented to the Library by George A. Zabriskie, president of the New York Historical Society. Other gifts received during the past year include original letters and documents relating to claims against the United States for Indian depredations at Bulow plantation in 1836; microfilm copy of a poem by Bartholome de Flores in 1571 concerning the Huguenot massacre in Florida; and many books and periodicals.

During the past three months the Department of Archives and Manuscripts of Louisiana State University has acquired forty-one groups of papers. The most

important is the Johnson (William T., and family) Memorial Collection, 1,320 items and 58 volumes (1793-1937). The twelve-volume diary (1835-1851) of William T. Johnson, a free Negro of Natchez, Mississippi, is the most significant part of the collection; it contains invaluable commentaries on Natchez social life, including horse racing, fighting, dueling, hunting, political campaigns, auctions, and theatricals. In addition to the historical value of Johnson's observations, his language was terse, entertaining, and—judged by modern standards—frequently quaint. The first half of the diary is illustrated with small pen sketches. The personal papers consist of family correspondence, manumission and other legal documents, and comments on plantation affairs. Commercial records include land and slave sales and purchases, tax receipts, and railroad stock certificates. Bank books, cash books, ledgers, sheet music, and two volumes of rare newspapers complete the collection. The diary is being edited for publication.

The manuscripts of the Richard T. Ely Economics Library form the Ely (Richard T.) Papers, a collection illustrating significant English economic organizations of the fifteenth through the nineteenth centuries. Early documents include such items as manor court proceedings, indentures, and a manor roll.

The Liddell (St. John R.) Collection, 6,000 items and 21 volumes (1809-1892), includes the personal and business papers, account books, and plantation diaries of Moses J. Liddell and his son, St. John R. Liddell, of Llanada plantation, Catahoula Parish, Louisiana. The collection is concerned for the most part with cotton production and plantation management of the Liddell holdings in Catahoula and Ouachita parishes, on Bayou Teche and Boeuf River, and in Arkansas and Mississippi, but other matters such as the war and reconstruction activities of General Liddell, and the feud between the Liddell and Jones families, are also treated.

The Stanton (Edwin M.) Collection, 2 volumes (1864-1866), contains official record books of matters referred to the office of the Secretary of War.

The history of the Louisiana sugar industry since 1880 is exemplified in the Pharr (John) Collection, approximately 10,000 items and 300 volumes (1878-1938), the complete commercial records of the John Pharr family of Berwick, containing account books and papers of a mill, plantations, and sugar chemical laboratory, as well as other connected industries, such as farming and dairying. Sketches by Julius Pharr of the sugar industry, co-operatives, and other organizations, and personal papers of the family complete the collection.

Social life and Louisiana customs are related in the Morris (Mrs. Thomas H.)-Sibley (Mrs. Mary W.) Papers, 93 items (1846-1910), a collection consisting, for the most part, of the correspondence of the wife of Thomas Henry Morris of Shreveport with her mother, Mrs. Mary Wells Sibley of Alexandria. Plantation affairs and news, social events, horse racing, the yellow fever epi-

demic of 1853 in Shreveport, the Alexandria fire of 1856, and Civil War events are treated in the collection.

Ante-bellum sugar plantation economy is outlined in the Hall (Weeks) Papers, 6,358 items (1852-1903). A majority of the papers were written in the 1850's and 1860's. A large file of letters are to John and Mary Moore of New Iberia from relatives and are concerned with political, family, and war news. The business papers of W. F. Weeks of the same period deal with the operation of a sugar plantation and relations with sugar factors in New Orleans.

The Wilson (W. Henry) Papers, 335 items (1779-1885), include a John Stuart letter (1779) to Alexander McGillivray, and the correspondence of John and James Innerarity of the John Forbes Company concerning relations with the Indians of East and West Florida. The correspondence following 1820 is that of W. Henry Wilson, commandant of several posts in Florida, and furnishes information on Indian affairs. The later ante-bellum period correspondence is almost entirely concerned with military matters. Wilson served as colonel in the Mexican War and the last item of the collection is a letter offering his services to the Confederacy.

The Fernandez (J. Fernand) Collection, approximately 200 items (1781-1934), comprises the personal and business papers of a New Orleans surveyor. The early papers are documents relating to land titles in South Louisiana; the later papers are plats and blueprints which illustrate the formation of towns, break-up of large plantations, and levee construction.

#### ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"The Life of Richard Malcolm Johnston in Maryland, 1867-1898," by Francis T. Long, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (December).

"Patowmeck Above Ye Inhabitants," A Commentary on the Subject of An Old Map," by William B. Marye, *ibid.*

"The Amazing Colonel Zarvona," by Charles A. Earp, *ibid.*

"Ships and Shipping of Seventeenth Century Maryland," continued, by V. J. Wychoff, *ibid.*

"The Virginia Free Negro Farmer and Property Owner, 1830-1860," by Luther P. Jackson, *ibid.*

"Life and Thought in a Student Organization of the Old South," by J. Harrison Hancock, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (October).

"The Old Villa That Stood on French Garden Hill," by Edward L. Ryan, *ibid.*

"A Note on the Jackson-Calhoun Breach of 1830-31," by Richard R. Stenberg, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (October).

"James Rumsey, 'Ingenuous Mechanic' and International Genius," by Matthew Page Andrews, in *West Virginia History* (October).

- "The Jones-Imboden Raid," by Festus P. Summers, *ibid.*
- "The Kinnan Massacre," by Boyd B. Stutler, *ibid.*
- "The Earliest Permanent Settlement in Carolina," by W. P. Cumming, in the *American Historical Review* (October).
- "The Life of Montfort Stokes in the Indian Territory," by Grant Foreman, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (October).
- "The Catawba Nation and Its Neighbors," by Frank G. Speck, *ibid.*
- "The Quiver and the Floral Wreath: Two Rare Charleston Periodicals," by Guy A. Cardwell, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Early Kentucky: Its Virginia Heritage," by Eugene M. Braderman, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (October).
- "Historic Meeting at Pisgah Church, Woodford County, Kentucky," by Katherine S. Bradley, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (October).
- "John Filson in Pennsylvania," by Samuel M. Wilson, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (October).
- "Propaganda and the Kansas-Missouri War," by Lloyd Lewis, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (October).
- "The Labor Movement in St. Louis Prior to the Civil War," by Russell M. Nolen, *ibid.*
- "Frontier Economic Problems in Missouri, 1815-1828," I, by Hattie M. Anderson, *ibid.*
- "Trinity Episcopal Church, Tulsa," by John Bartlett Meserve, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (September).
- "The Homesteader and the Development of Woodward County," by Ralph E. Randels, *ibid.*
- "Problems of a Cherokee Principal Chief," by Harold Keith, *ibid.*
- "The Civil War in the Indian Territory, 1861," by Dean Trickett, *ibid.*
- "A Cross-Section in the Life of a Missionary Teacher Among the Indians," by Louise Thomson, *ibid.*
- "Choctaw Indian Dishes," by Peter J. Hudson, *ibid.*

#### DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Letters of Archbishop Maréchal," translated by W. S. Reilly, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (December).
- "John McDonogh and Maryland Colonization in Liberia, 1834-1835," edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., in the *Journal of Negro History* (October).
- "William Byrd Title Book," edited by R. A. Lancaster, Jr., in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (October).
- "The Pride of Virginia, the Heroes of Fort Meigs," edited by Lenora H. Sweeny, *ibid.*

- "Notes from the Records of Stafford County, Virginia, Order Books," concluded, *ibid.*
- "Letters from Old Trunks (From James Barron Hope)," contributed and annotated by Mrs. W. T. Barron, *ibid.*
- "Memorial to George Hume, Esquire," concluded, edited by Edgar E. Hume, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (October).
- "Unpublished Letters from North Carolinians to Polk," continued, edited by Elizabeth G. McPherson, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (October).
- "A Bibliography of Paul Sawyer, American Artist, 1865-1917," compiled and annotated by Willard Rouse Jillson, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (October).
- "The Escape of Confederate Secretary of War John Cabell Breckinridge as Revealed by His Diary," edited by A. J. Hanna, *ibid.*
- "Early Marriage Records of Madison County, Kentucky," continued, compiled by W. Rodes Shackelford, *ibid.*
- "Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," continued, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Cliff, *ibid.*
- "Bourbon Circuit Court Records: Suits in Abstract," edited by Julia S. Ardery, *ibid.*
- "Joseph R. Underwood's Fragmentary Journal on the New and Old Court Contest in Kentucky," edited by Arndt M. Stickles, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (October).
- "Letters Regarding Choctaw Missions and Missionaries," edited by Anna Lewis, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (September).
- "Diary of Joseph A. Edmonds," edited by James W. Moffitt, *ibid.*

## ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "The Public Records of South Carolina," by R. H. Woody, in the *American Archivist* (October).
- "J. D. B. De Bow," by O. C. Skipper, in the Huguenot Society of South Carolina, *Transactions*, No. 44.
- "Mulberry Grove from the Revolution to the Present Time," by Savannah Unit, Georgia Writers' Project, WPA, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (December).
- "William H. Crawford and the Bank of the United States," by Philip J. Green, *ibid.*
- "Notes on Medical Practice in Colonial Georgia," by Joseph Krafka, *ibid.*
- "Ralph Waldo Emerson in Florida," by Mrs. Henry L. Richmond, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "Complete Register of Marked Graves of White Persons in Monroe County, Mississippi, Compiled in 1938," by W. A. Evans, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (July).

- "The Vicksburg Campaign of 1863," by Ross H. Moore, *ibid.*  
 "Spanish Activities in the Lower Mississippi Valley, 1513-1698," by Alfred B. Thomas, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (October).  
 "Privateersmen of the Gulf and Their Prizes," by Stanley Faye, *ibid.*  
 "New Orleans and the Cuban Question during the Lopez Expeditions of 1849-1851," by Chester Stanley Urban, *ibid.*  
 "O. Henry in Texas," by Trueman O'Quinn, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (October).  
 "Norwegian Migration to Texas: A Historic Resume with Four 'America Letters,'" by Lyder L. Unstad, *ibid.*  
 "The Counter-Revolution of Béxar, 1811," by J. Villasana Haggard, *ibid.*

#### DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Letters from Col. Lewis Morris to Miss Ann Elliott," contributed by Morris Rutherford, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (October).  
 "Abstracts from the Records of the Court of Ordinary 1764-1771," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, *ibid.*  
 "Journal of Gen. Peter Horry," continued, edited by A. S. Salley, *ibid.*  
 "The Thomas Elfe Account Book 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*  
 "Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*  
 "Letters of Barnett Hardeman Cody and Others, 1861-1864," contributed, with notes, by Edmund Cody Burnett, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (December).  
 "Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," XIII, edited and translated by D. C. Corbitt, *ibid.*  
 "Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," VIII, by Julia E. Harn, *ibid.*  
 "An Unpublished Letter of General Lachlan McIntosh," edited by C. M. Destler, *ibid.*  
 "The East Coast in 1870," in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (October).  
 "A Diary of Jesse Talbot Bernard," edited by Mrs. Rebecca Phillips, *ibid.*  
 "The Panton, Leslie Papers: Concluding the Letters of Edmund Doyle, Trader," *ibid.*  
 "The Civil War Letters of Cordelia Scales," edited by Percy L. Rainwater, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (July).  
 "An Illinois Soldier in North Mississippi: Diary of John Wilson, February 15-December 30, 1862," edited by J. V. Frederick, *ibid.*  
 "Minutes of the Assembly of West Florida," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (October).

- "Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana, October-December, 1753," LXXXI, by Heloise H. Cruzat, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*
- "Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, January-February, 1784," LXIII, by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*
- "Folk Life in Early Texas: The Autobiography of Andrew Davis," contributed by R. L. Jones, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "A Letter Book of Joseph Eve, United States Chargé D'Affaires to Texas," introduction by Joseph M. Vance, *ibid.*

## GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

- "The Relations of Herndon and Gibbon's Exploration of the Amazon to North American Slavery, 1850-1855," by Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* (November).
- "Thomas Jefferson and the Democratic Faith," by John Dewey, in the *Virginia Quarterly Review* (Winter).
- "Historians and Mythmakers," by Matthew Josephson, *ibid.*
- "The Seal of the South," by Paul P. Walsh, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (October).
- "Discovering the South," by Jonathan Daniels, in the *Southern Association Quarterly* (August).
- "Lincoln and the Faribault Fire-Eater," by W. A. Harbison, in *Minnesota History* (September).
- "The Southern Influence in the Formation of Illinois," by John D. Barnhart, in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (September).
- "Wisconsin Republicans and Reconstruction, 1865-70," by Helen J. and Harry Williams, in the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* (September).
- "The Commemoration of Antietam and Gettysburg," by James W. Fesler, in the *Indiana Magazine of History* (September).
- "Joseph G. Cannon and John Sharp Williams," by George C. Osborn, *ibid.*
- "A Circuit of the South in the Summer of 1924," by William O. Lynch, *ibid.*
- "The Status of Historical Bibliography in the United States," by Solon J. Buck, in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (October).
- "Daniel Howell Hise: Abolitionist and Reformer," by Lewis E. Atherton, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (December).
- "The Loyal Publication Society: A Pro-Union Propaganda Agency," by Frank Freidel, *ibid.*
- "The Third Book on Kansas: An Interpretation of J. Butler Chapman's 'History of Kansas and Emigrants' Guide,'" by Cora Dolbee, in the *Kansas Historical Quarterly* (August).
- "The Route of De Soto: Delisle's Interpretation," by Barbara Boston, in *Mid-America* (October).

## CONTRIBUTORS

CHARLES S. SYDNOR is professor of history at Duke University.

FRANK L. OWSLEY is professor of history at Vanderbilt University.

HARRIET C. (Mrs. Frank L.) OWSLEY is collaborator with her husband in historical research.

ALBERT V. HOUSE, JR., is professor of history at Wilson Teachers College.

JAMES W. PATTON is professor of history at Converse College.

FLETCHER M. GREEN is professor of history at the University of North Carolina.

P. L. RAINWATER is a collector of southern historical material.

**T H E**  
**SOUTHERN REVIEW**  
**A Critical Quarterly**

**IN COMING ISSUES**

Sandburg's *Lincoln*

by Charles W. Ramsdell

Origins of the American Civil War

by Frank L. Owsley

The Attack on Leviathan

by Walter Prescott Webb

The Anatomy of Revolution

by Sidney Hook

The Letters of Lincoln Steffens

by Max Lerner

Victorian Critics of Democracy

Lionel Trilling

Literary Articles and Reviews, Fiction, Poetry

**75c a copy**

**\$3.00 a year**

**Published by**

**LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS**  
**UNIVERSITY, LA., U.S.A.**

## THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

A quarterly journal dealing with the history of the  
Latin American countries.

JOHN TATE LANNING } EDITORS  
ALAN K. MANCHESTER }

*Contents of the November (1939) Issue*

FATHER JOSEPH NEUMANN, JESUIT  
MISSIONARY TO THE TARAHUMARES  
THE RECAPTURE OF SANTA FE, NEW  
MEXICO, BY THE SPANIARDS—DE-  
CEMBER 29-30, 1693

GENERAL URQUIZA AND THE BATTLE OF  
PAVÓN (1861)

THE RELATION OF HERNDON AND GIBBON'S  
EXPLORATION OF THE AMAZON TO  
NORTH AMERICAN SLAVERY, 1850-1855

Allan Cristelow  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY  
J. Manuel Espinosa  
ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

A. J. Walford  
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,  
LONDON  
Whitfield J. Bell, Jr.  
DICKINSON COLLEGE

BOOK REVIEWS

DOCUMENTS

NOTES AND COMMENT

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SECTION

SUBSCRIPTION: \$4.00 A YEAR

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Durham, N. C.

## VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Organized 1831—Chartered 1834  
JOSEPH D. EGGLESTON, PRESIDENT

Publishers of the

VIRGINIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The October issue contained the following:

**William Byrd Title Book**, edited by Robert A. Lancaster, Jr.  
**Life and Thought in a Student Organization of the Old South**,  
by J. Harrison Hancock.

**Notes and Documents.**

Genealogy and Book Reviews

Membership dues \$5.00 annually.

Magazine sent without additional charge to members.

LEE HOUSE, 707 EAST FRANKLIN ST., EDITOR AND CORRESPONDING SEC'Y  
RICHMOND, VA. ROBERT A. LANCASTER, JR.,

ANNOUNCING FOR SPRING, 1940

# FELIX GRUNDY

## CHAMPION OF DEMOCRACY

BY JOSEPH HOWARD PARKS

This study presents through the medium of biography the period of vigorous nationalistic growth culminating in the Jacksonian Era. Felix Grundy, one of the great criminal lawyers of the frontier, began his political career in Kentucky and Tennessee. In local and state offices, he played a prominent part in the settlement of such problems as banking, the land questions, and relief. As a principal in national affairs from the War of 1812 through the Jacksonian Era, Grundy's political partisanship became evident in his frequent clashes with Clay and his enthusiastic support of Jackson.

x, 368 Pages. 5½"x8½". Buckram, Ill. \$3.50.

SOUTHERN BIOGRAPHY SERIES, NUMBER 1

# PAPAL ENFORCEMENT OF SOME MEDIEVAL MARRIAGE LAWS

BY CHARLES EDWARD SMITH

This study traces the development of canonical impediments to marital relationship to 1302. Papal action in the celebrated cases of Lothair II, Philip Augustus, Alfonso IX, and other medieval figures is described, together with a discussion of the exercise of papal dispensing powers with emphasis on political, social, and religious motives prompting it.

viii, 230 Pages. 5½"x8½". Cloth. \$2.50.

PUBLISHED BY LOUISIANA STATE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS      UNIVERSITY, LA.

# THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



## PRESIDENT

FRANK L. OWSLEY, Vanderbilt University

## VICE-PRESIDENT

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of the University of  
North Carolina

## SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, Converse College

## EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

## EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY, University of Virginia (1940)

PHILIP M. HAMER, The National Archives (1941)

CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University (1942)

## MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

## ELECTED MEMBERS

THOMAS D. CLARK, University of Kentucky (1940)

BELL I. WILEY, University of Mississippi (1940)

KATHRYN T. ABBEY, Florida State College for Women (1941)

AVERY O. CRAVEN, University of Chicago (1941)

MINNIE CLARE BOYD, Mississippi State College for Women (1942)

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina (1942)